DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 426 545 EC 306 981

AUTHOR	Milian, Madeline; Ferrell, Kay Alicyn
TITLE	Preparing Special Educators To Meet the Needs of Students Who Are Learning English as a Second Language and Are Visually Impaired: A Monograph.
INSTITUTION	University of Northern Colorado, Greeley. Coll. of Education.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	133p.
CONTRACT	H029B30137
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Braille; *Course Content; *Cultural Differences; Diversity (Student); Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Federal Regulation; Higher Education; Limited English Speaking; *Minority Group Children; *Preservice Teacher Education; Spanish Speaking; Special Education Teachers; Staff Development; Surveys; Teacher Competencies; *Visual Impairments
IDENTIFIERS	Colorado

ABSTRACT

This monograph describes a personnel preparation program that prepared 32 Colorado special education graduates to meet the needs of students who are learning English as a second language and are visually impaired. Graduates took a course that was specially designed to expose students to relevant literature on federal mandates for the education of students from linguistically diverse communities, teaching methodology appropriate for students with limited proficiency and academic achievement, working with families from diverse cultures, using translators, and the teaching of the Spanish braille code. Moreover, students spent 10 hours observing English as a Second Language (ESL) teachers in public schools. The second part of the monograph details changes incorporated into targeted courses related to multicultural issues and provides a list of competencies related to the education of linguistically diverse students with visual impairments to assist in the development of relevant course objectives. The third part of the monograph discusses the results of a survey of 361 educators working with students with visual impairments that identifies some of the challenges of working with linguistically diverse students. The fourth part of the monograph contains an annotated bibliography of relevant resources. (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 426 545

Preparing Special Educators to Meet the Needs of Students who are Learning English as a Second Language and are Visually Impaired:

A Monograph

Madeline Milian and Kay Alicyn Ferrell

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EC 306981

University of Northern Colorado
College of Education
Greeley, CO 80639

Preparing Special Educators to Meet the Needs of Students who are Learning English as a Second Language and are Visually Impaired:

A Monograph

Madeline Milian and Kay Alicyn Ferrell

University of Northern Colorado
College of Education
Greeley, CO 80639
1998

This project was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Grant #H029B30137.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project could not have been possible without the support from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Its financial support provided for the partial funding of the Project Coordinator, tuition for students completing their M.A., support of the Advisory Committee, and many other costs associated with restructuring a personnel preparation program.

The suggestions and feedback provided by the members of the Advisory Committee were invaluable to the implementation of the project. Without their contributions we would not have been able to achieve the goals we had established for the project.

The participation of 361 educators who completed the survey was essential to the project. We have learned much from what they shared with us, and their participation will help to improve what we have started to do at the University of Northern Colorado. We appreciate their commitment and would like to thank them and the administrators who facilitated the distribution of surveys in each individual state.

We would also like to acknowledge the efforts of our project faculty members. Their willingness to restructure their courses and openness to learn new content made this project a success. Certainly, we could not have accomplished the infusion of new competencies without their support.

Carmel Yarger and Patrika Griego, our graduate assistants, helped with editing, typing, and data analysis of open-ended questions. We sincerely appreciate their assistance and suggestions.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Prof. Leonard Baca
Director
BUENO Center
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado

Ms. Lila Cabbil
The Upshaw Institute for the Blind
Detroit, MI

Prof. Vivian I. Correa
Department of Special Education
University of Florida
Gainsville, Florida

Ms. Betty Dominguez
New Mexico School for the
Visually Handicapped Preschool
(1993-1995)

Dr. Joy Efron
Coordinator Program Visual
Disabilities
Frances Blend School for the Blind
Los Angeles, California

Dr. Phil Hatlen
Superintendent
Texas School for the Blind and
Visually Impaired
Austin, Texas

Ms. Cheryl Leidich
Vision Program
Denver Public Schools
Denver, Colorado

Prof. Barbara Rhine
University of Northern Colorado
Division of Special Education
Greeley, Colorado

PROJECT FACULTY MEMBERS

Prof. Kay Alicyn Ferrell
Project Director

Prof. Madeline Milian
Project Coordinator

Prof. David Kappan

Prof. Carol Love
Advisory Committee Member and
Project Faculty

Prof. Bill Muir

Prof. Sandra Ruconich

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Part I: Introduction to the Project 1

Part II: Curriculum Modifications 8

Part III: Educating Students with Visual Impairments and Limited English Proficiency: A Survey of Educators 31

Part IV: Annotated Bibliography 81

Appendix A: Educating Students with Visual Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP): A Survey of Educators 116

LIST OF TABLES

page
Table 1. Number of Educators Participating........................ 32
Table 2. Positions Held by Educators and Settings Where They Worked........................ 33
Table 3. Age of Educators........................ 33
Table 4. Gender of Educators........................ 34
Table 5. Ethnic or Racial Background of Educators........................ 34
Table 6. Total Number of Years Teaching........................ 35
Table 7. Educator's Areas of Certification........................ 35
Table 8. Additional Certification........................ 35
Table 9. Highest Degree Earned........................ 36
Table 10. Number of Educators who Reported Speaking a Language Other Than English and Languages Reported Speaking........................ 36
Table 11. Training Related to Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students and Type of Training........................ 38
Table 12. Number of Respondents Working with Students who Come from Homes Where Languages Other than English are Spoken........................ 38
Table 13. Information About Students........................ 40
Table 14. Number of Students by Age, Disability, and Language Category........................ 40
Table 15. Rating of Educators' Knowledge on Selected Items and Their Importance When Working with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Visual Impairments........................ 42
Table 16. Percent of Respondents Reporting Using Specific Strategies and Approaches with English Speaking Students with Visual Impairments........................ 46
Table 17. Percent of Respondents Reporting Using Specific Strategies and Approaches with Limited English Proficient Students with Visual Impairments........................ 47

page

Table 18. Number and Percent of Reported Use of Approaches and Strategies with English Speaking and Limited English Proficient Students with Visual Impairments 48
Table 19. Percent of Responses Indicating Instructional Practices for Students with Limited Proficiency in English who are Visually Impaired 57
Table 20. Percent of Responses Indicating Assessment Practices for Students with Limited Proficiency in English who are Visually Impaired 59
Table 21. Percent of Reported Assessment and Instructional Practices with Students with Visual Impairments who are Learning English as a Second Language... 61

Part I: Introduction to the Project

In 1993, the University of Northern Colorado received a four-year training grant from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) to review and restructure its existing Vision and Orientation and Mobility Teacher Preparation Program. A number of goals were to be achieved, including the completion of a needs assessment and the infusion of competencies into the program related to the educational needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students who are blind or visually impaired, particularly those with limited proficiency in English.

The program faculty members were guided by six objectives when working on the development of new competencies to include within the program. This document will explain each objective, how each objective was achieved, and the results obtained, so that other teacher preparation programs across the United States can benefit from our efforts and possibly incorporate similar changes into their curriculum.

Although the activities of this training grant offered a framework for change, we recognize that the modifications we made will need to be updated frequently so that we offer our graduate students information that is current and based on best practices for students who are visually impaired and come from linguistically and culturally diverse communities. This task, however, will be much easier now that we have developed a system to review the content of our courses and appropriate activities to address this population.

The following objectives guided faculty members in the development and achievement of this project:

1. Provision of financial support to 32 graduates in Severe Needs: Vision and Orientation and Mobility over a four-year period;
2. Introduction of a new course addressing Spanish reading, Spanish braille code, reading and writing methodology that have been found

successful for students with limited English proficiency, and adaptation of materials to facilitate instruction in English and the child's native language;

3. Infusion of competencies addressing multicultural issues into existing courses, so that graduates will be responsive to the needs of students and families;
4. Increase recruitment efforts to attract qualified native-Spanish speakers;
5. Establishment of an Advisory Committee to assist the project in meeting its goals; and
6. Preparation and distribution to university programs in education of students with visual disabilities of a Monograph on current practices with LEP students who have visual disabilities.

Although we devoted sufficient time and effort to the achievement of all objectives, our success rate was not the same with all six objectives. It is our opinion that the difficulties encountered with the achievement of certain goals point to the difficulties in the recruitment of minority students into our field, particularly those who are native speakers of Spanish or come from Latino groups. Following is an explanation of each of the objectives and the activities we conducted to meet the objective.

Achievement of Objectives

Provision of financial support to 32 graduates in Severe Needs: Vision and Orientation and Mobility over a four-year period.

The project attracted thirty students between Academic Years 1993-94 and 1996-97. By the end of the fourth year of the project, eighteen students had graduated, two students were in their final semester, four students were entering their second year, four students withdrew from the program, one student changed major, and one student was on leave for medical reasons. In addition to the students working on their Master of Arts in Severe Needs Vision, this project was able to hire two doctoral students in Special Education who served as our Research Assistants. The project thus provided financial support to thirty-two students.

Among the thirty-two students supported by this project, twenty-two were women, six students had disabilities, and four were members of ethnic or racial minority groups.

Introduction of a new course addressing Spanish reading, Spanish braille code, reading and writing methodology that have been found successful for student with limited English proficiency, and adaptation of materials to facilitate instruction in English and the child's native language.

This course was specifically designed with the purpose of exposing students to relevant literature on federal mandates for the education of students from linguistically diverse communities; teaching methodology appropriate for students with limited proficiency in English; instructional modifications to meet the language and vision needs of students; assessment issues relating to the testing of language proficiency and academic achievement; working with families from diverse cultures; using translators; and the teaching of the Spanish braille code.

Moreover, students spent ten hours observing English as a Second Language teachers in public schools and were required to think about ways to deliver instruction to ESL students with visual impairments. A number of students had the opportunity to observe and interact with visually impaired students who were in the process of learning English and were able to ask teachers about specific activities that appear to be effective with these students.

This course was taught four times and will continue to be taught as part of our regular academic year program. As with any new course, modifications were made to take into consideration the suggestions of students gathered through the end of semester evaluation. A course syllabus has been included in the Curriculum Modifications Section.

Infusion of competencies addressing multicultural issues into existing courses, so that graduates will be responsive to the needs of students and families.

The development of a specialized course was an essential component of the restructuring of the program, but not the only change that was needed. We believed that the integration of competencies within existing courses would provide additional opportunities to further explore and discuss topics that may be relevant to linguistically diverse students and families.

At our first Advisory Committee meeting held at the University of Northern Colorado, we presented each member of the Advisory Committee and Program Faculty attending the meeting with copies of all Vision and Mobility course syllabi and a "Review of Course Content and Suggestion Form." Participating Advisory Committee and Program Faculty members were asked to review each course and complete the form, which required suggestions related to student objectives, broad content area, course assignments, required and recommended readings, and other general suggestions related to the education of linguistically diverse students in general and more specifically to those with visual impairments.

The second step was completed by the Project Coordinator and consisted of reviewing all suggestions and determining which courses had generated significant number of suggestions. As a result of this process the following courses were identified as courses that were conducive to the inclusion of topics related to language and culture within the population of students with visual impairments. The courses selected were: Independent Living for the Visually Handicapped, Assessment and Methods for Teaching Students with Visual/Multiple Disabilities, Technology for Individuals with Visual Handicaps, Principles of Orientation and Mobility for the Visually Handicapped, Educational and Medical Implications for Visual Impairment, Advanced Seminar in Education of Students with Visual Handicaps, and Psychosocial Needs of Individuals with Visual Handicaps.

Each faculty member was provided with a copy of the suggestions for each course gathered through the group activity to facilitate the process of revising the course objectives, content, assignments, and readings. A readings file was kept in the Vision Resource Room, and bibliographies with relevant readings were frequently shared with faculty members. In addition, the Project Coordinator served as a guest speaker for topics related to culture and language and provided faculty members with related readings and other instructional materials so that faculty members could build a knowledge base and feel comfortable with the infusion of new competencies into their courses. Faculty members attended workshops and conferences related to the educational needs of linguistically diverse students such as the symposium sponsored by CEC's Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Division, the Bilingual Special Education Training offered through the BUENO Center for Multicultural Education at the University of Colorado at Boulder, and the annual conference sponsored by the National Association of Bilingual Educators.

Suggested changes for the courses identified for revision are included under Curriculum Modifications.

Increase recruitment efforts to attract qualified native-Spanish speakers.

Recruitment activities were varied and concentrated on increasing the total number of students in the Vision and O & M Program, to include minority students from all groups and more specifically the number of students who came from Hispanic communities and spoke Spanish. As part of our recruitment activities we mailed information about the program to the following agencies and organizations:

- All public schools in Colorado
- All 38 members of the Council of Historically Black Colleges
- Universities in the Southwest with large numbers of minority student enrollment
- Tribal colleges in the Western states

- All schools for the Blind in the United States
- Hispanic Cultural Center and the Marcus Garvey Center at UNC

We also distributed information about the program through:

- SpecialNet
- Flyers at National Conferences such as CEC, TASH, AER, and "Getting in Touch with Literacy"
- Visiones, a Denver based Hispanic magazine

Although we were very successful in increasing the total number of students entering and completing our program, we were less successful in meeting our intended goal of attracting more minority and native Spanish speakers students into the program. At the completion of this project we had only recruited four students from underrepresented groups and one European-American student who was bilingual. The rest of the students participating in the project were all European-American who did not have language fluency in languages other than English.

The difficulties we encountered identifying and attracting minority students into our project point to the need to continue targeting recruitment that will reach out to underrepresented students from diverse culture and language groups. Additionally, given that the majority of students entering Vision and O & M Programs will be European-American with different degrees of familiarity with children who come from diverse cultures and language groups, it is imperative that personnel preparation programs provide opportunities for trainees to develop competencies that will facilitate their future involvement with these children.

Establishment of an Advisory Committee to assist the project in meeting its goals.

The establishment of an Advisory Committee was one of the first activities we conducted. Advisory Committee members were selected and invited to participate on the basis of their experience working with either students with visual impairments or those from linguistically diverse groups. During the funding period, three meetings were held in Colorado to inform them of the progress we were making and to solicit additional ideas related to recruitment, program modifications, and the needs assessment. Advisory Committee members were instrumental in:

- Contributing to the infusion of multicultural competencies into the program;
- Providing ideas for recruitment activities;
- Revising and suggesting questions to be included in the needs assessments survey; and
- Assisting with the distribution of the survey

Advisory Committee members became very involved in the activities of this project. Instead of limiting their participation to an "advisory" role, committee members became full participants in the project, and in doing so, this project benefited from their talent and professional experiences.

Preparation and distribution to university programs in education of students with visual disabilities of a Monograph on current practices with LEP students who have visual disabilities.

This Monograph constitutes the culminating experience of the project and our vehicle to share what we have learned with other teacher preparation programs in vision and O & M. It is our hope that by sharing the process we followed and the content area changes, other programs will benefit from our efforts by incorporating some of these changes into their programs as appropriate.

We are distributing at least one copy of the Monograph to each personnel preparation program. Permission is granted to duplicate parts of this Monograph for educational purpose as needed.

Part II. Curriculum Modifications

This section will detail the changes incorporated into the targeted courses related to multicultural issues and will provide a course outline for EDSE 508: Teaching Second Language Learners with Visual Impairments. Advisory Committee Members and Program Faculty Members collaborated in providing students' objectives and assignments related to multicultural issues within the population of students with visual impairments. As previously mentioned, every time the courses have been taught, minor changes to content and readings have been made. A list of possible assignments is included for faculty members to select from when teaching individual courses.

In addition to the suggested modifications for individual courses, a list of competencies related to the education of linguistically diverse students with visual impairments is provided to assist in the development of relevant course objectives.

Course Number and Title:
EDSE 540: Independent Living for the Visually Handicapped

Student Objectives:

- Understand the differences in various cultures regarding the acquisition of independent living skills by children.
- Understand how social and recreation skills may differ in content and importance among various cultures.
- Recognition and sensitivity to cultural concerns (e.g., if a family does not want a male family member to cook his own food, then this would be an objective that will require negotiation with the family).
- Understand families' views of independence as related to their cultural beliefs of child rearing.

Course Assignments:

- Go to a toy store and identify toys that could be easily used with blind students who come from other cultures and language groups. Identify small modifications needed to use popular toys with students who speak a language other than English.
- Interview culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) student with visual disability or family in reference to their beliefs on independence and gender roles.
- Have CLD family and student panel: Parents of V.I. students, or adolescents and young adults with visual impairments talking about issues of independence, daily living skills, mobility, and other relevant concerns.
- Engage in volunteer work or visits to community with minority groups. Such activities could include: attending local fiestas, restaurants, grocery stores.
- Interview community leaders from CLD groups (e.g., priest, grocers, day-care center director).
- Compile a resource kit of materials available in languages other than English from local, state, and national agencies.
- Compile a list in English and another language with the names of household items and other items frequently used by people when

doing activities associated with daily living skills (e.g., ingredients, things to label around the house, etc.).

- Have panel of discussion where persons with visual impairments relate personal experiences in using adaptations, etc. Include people from different cultures.

Readings:

Clay, J. A. (1992). Native American independent living. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 11(1), 41-50.

Correa, V. I. (1992). Cultural accessibility of services for culturally diverse clients with disabilities and their families. Rural Special Education Quarterly, 11(2), 6-12.

Davenport, D. S., & Yurich, J. M. (1991). Multicultural gender issues. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70(1), 64-71.

Nel, J. (1993). Preventing school failure: The native American child. Preventing School Failure, 37(3), 19-24.

Sacks, Z. S., Kekelis, L. S. & Gaylord-Ross R. J. (1992). The development of social skills by blind and visually impaired students: Exploratory studies and strategies. New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Scheer, J. & Groce, N. (1988). Impairment as a human constant: Cross-cultural and historical perspectives on variation. Journal of Social Issues, 44(1), 23-37.

Smart, J. F., & Smart, D. W. (1991). Acceptance of disability and the Mexican American culture. Rehabilitation Counseling Bulletin, 34(4), 357-67.

Course Number and Title:

EDSE 542: Assessment and Methods for Teaching Students with Visual/Multiple Disabilities

Student Objectives:

- Adapt commercially available assessments and develop strategies for assessing students who are learning English as a new language.
- Become familiar with formal and informal bilingual assessments.
- Understand transdisciplinary assessment procedures.
- Understand authentic assessment strategies.
- Discuss the use of interpreters in reporting assessments results to family members who speak a language other than English.
- Discuss strategies for communicating with non-English speaking families.
- Develop list of questions to be used to obtain pertinent information from non-English speaking families regarding the needs of non-verbal VI/MH students.
- Discuss issues related to the use of native language + English vs. English only with VI/MH students.
- Discuss ways to incorporate the student's native language into the educational program.

Course Assignments:

- Conduct a language sample assessment of a LEP/VI student and analyze it. Write assessment report.
- Observe a bilingual team (school psychologist, etc.) assess a student with visual impairments who speaks a language other than English.
- Translate or develop survival non-English words for conducting functional vision assessment.
- Conduct an interview with a non-English speaking family concerning issues of communication and social interaction with their MH/VI child.
- Interview school personnel on the topic of educating students who come from culturally and linguistically diverse students with visual impairments.

- Observe a student who speaks a language other than English when interacting with school personnel and at home.
- Review commercially available bilingual assessment and write a list of modifications needed when using assessment tool with LEP/VI student.

Readings:

Barrera, I. (1993). Effective and appropriate instruction for all children: The challenge of cultural/linguistic diversity and young children with special needs. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13(4), 461-487.

Hamayan, E. V., & Damico, J. S. (Eds.) (1991). Limiting bias in the assessment of bilingual students. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Hanson, M. J., Lynch, E. W., & Wayman, R. I. (1990). Honoring the cultural diversity of families when gathering data. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10(1), 112-131.

Lim, L. H. F., & Browder, D. (1994). Multicultural life skills assessment of individuals with severe disabilities. The Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps, 19(2), 130-138.

Wayman, K. I., Lynch, E. W., & Hanson, M. J. (1990). Home based early childhood services: Cultural sensitivity in a family systems approach. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 10(4), 56-75.

Course Number and Title:
EDSE 544: Technology for Individuals with Visual Handicaps

Student Objectives:

- Identify available software to facilitate the teaching of English.
- Identify available software to support the teaching of the native language and languages other than English.
- Identify keyboard functions needed to write in a language other than English.
- Identify hardware with access to languages other than English.

Course Assignments:

- Develop lessons for teaching keyboard skills via computer software with large print monitor and speech.
- Develop lessons for teaching students to use scanner, Versa Braille, Braille n' Speak, etc.
- Develop resource list of software and hardware available in languages other than English.
- Review commercially available ESL programs and assess their application for students with visual impairments.

Readings:

Lalas, J., & Wilson, T. (1993). Focus on multicultural schools: New technologies for ESL students. Media and Methods, 29(4), 20-21.

Lopez, D., & Lester, S. (1994). Smart choices for the ESL classroom. Technology & Learning, 14(7), 22-23, 26-32.

Milone, M. (1993). Closed-caption TV: A new tool for reading and ESOL. Technology and Learning, 14(1), 22-23.

Schick, J. A. , & Walker de Felix, J. (1992). Using technology to help teachers meet the needs of language minority students in the USA. Journal of Information Technology for Teacher Education, 1(2), 159-171.

Course Number and Title:

EDSE 546: Principles of Orientation and Mobility for the Visually Handicapped

Student Objectives:

- Develop an understanding of communication techniques to use with parents of children with visual impairments from various cultural backgrounds.
- Identify cultural variables that may impact on the delivery of orientation and mobility services.
- Identify program modifications necessary when providing orientation and mobility services to students with limited knowledge of English.

Course Assignments:

- Have students select a language other than English and write a list of vocabulary words needed when delivering O&M instruction.
- Read three articles related to the delivery of O&M instruction or rehabilitation services to people from diverse cultures. Write a paper stating the challenges faced by professionals when working with students from diverse cultures. Discuss some strategies that will facilitate the provision of services. Present paper in class.
- Using language that is family friendly, develop a pamphlet for families with the goal of explaining the area of Orientation and Mobility. Write the pamphlet in English and in a selected second language.

Readings:

Dodson-Burk, Hill, E. W. (1989). An orientation and mobility primer for families and young children. New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Foy, C. J. (1991). English/Spanish basics for orientation and mobility instructors. New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Leung, P., & Sakata, R. (1988). Asian Americans and rehabilitation: Some important variables. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 19(4), 16-20.

Lowrey, L. (1987). Rehabilitation relevant to culture and disability. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 81(4), 162-164.

Martin, W. E,. Frank, L. W., Minkler, S., & Johnson, M. (1988). A survey of vocational rehabilitation counselors who work with American Indians. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 19(4), 29-34.

Santiago, A. (1988). Provision of vocational rehabilitation services to blind and visually impaired Hispanics: The case of New Jersey. Journal of Applied Rehabilitation Counseling, 19(4), 11-15.

Course Number and Title:

EDSE 641: Educational and Medical Implications for Visual Impairment

Student Objectives:

- Familiarity with incidence of visual impairments among ethnic minority groups.
- Identify factors that may contribute to lack of medical or educational services for members of diverse groups with visual disabilities.
- Familiarity with beliefs or perceptions about visual impairment and blindness held by members of culturally and linguistically diverse groups.
- Develop survival vocabulary of ophthalmology terms and phrases needed to conduct functional vision assessment.

Course Assignments:

- Visit a local ophthalmologist who sees clients from diverse cultures and discuss aspects of identification, services, treatment, and other issues related to working with members of minority groups.
- Develop a list of words, phrases, and sentences in a language other than English that will facilitate the process of conducting a functional vision assessment with students who speak a language other than English.
- Interview professionals in the field of vision who work with individuals from diverse culture and language groups and investigate some of the successful strategies they have used with this population.

Readings:

Kirchner, C. (1988). Data on blindness and visual impairment in the U.S.: A resource manual on social demographic characteristics, education, employment and income, and service delivery. New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Orr, A. L. (1993). Training outreach workers to serve American Indian elders with visual impairment and diabetes. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 87(9), 336-340.

Ponchillia, S. V. (1993). The effect of cultural beliefs on the treatment of native peoples with diabetes and visual impairment. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 87(9), 333-335.

Course Number and Title:

EDSE 642: Advanced Seminar in Education of Students with Visual Handicaps

Student Objectives:

- Understand diversity in its broadest sense.
- Explore concerns related to families of students with visual impairments who come from linguistically diverse communities.
- Identify how the role of Itinerant, Resource Room, and Residential School teachers can change when providing services for LEP/VI students.
- Develop IEP goals for LEP students that incorporate vision and language needs.
- Familiarity with assessment instruments that are available in a non-English language.
- Familiarity with teaming strategies for teaching and assessment.
- Familiarity with materials procurement for students who are speakers and readers of a non-English language.
- Familiarity with home visitation strategies. Listening and communication techniques to facilitate culturally sensitive, non-judgmental visits to build on the cultural style and needs of the families.

Course Assignments:

- Family interview and write-up (report/log) with a family of a linguistically diverse student with visual impairment.
- Family panel (include culturally/linguistically diverse family).
- Locate and review two assessment tools that are available in English and in a non-English language.
- Read three articles related to the teaching of reading to ESL students and write how you could incorporate the suggestions offered by authors when teaching VI/ESL students.

Readings:

Huebner, K. M. (1986). Curriculum adaptations: Foreign languages. In G. T. Scholl (Ed.), Foundations of education for blind and visually handicapped children and youth: Theory and practice (pp. 381-385). New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Milian, M. (1996). Knowledge of basic concepts of young students with visual impairments who are monolingual or bilingual. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 90(5), 386-399.

Morsink, C. V., Thomas, C. Ch., & Correa, V. I. (1992). Interactive teaming : Consultation and collaboration in special programs. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company.

Course Number and Title:

EDSE 643 Psychosocial Needs of Individuals with Visual Handicaps

Student Objectives:

- Understanding the impact of visual impairments on independence and self-esteem.
- Understanding how blindness impacts on the family dynamics of various cultures.
- Explore personal attitudes regarding culturally diverse individuals.
- Familiarize students with the concept of extended families: roles, responsibilities, and other related issues.
- Explore cultural differences in discipline patterns.
- Explore cultural, religious, and spiritual beliefs as coping resources.
- Familiarize students with issues of transition from school to work, and how culturally diverse families view the process.
- Understand how the families' beliefs, stigmas of visual disabilities, and treatment for children with visual impairments impact on their views of school programs. How are beliefs, stigmas, and treatment different among members of different cultures?

Course Assignments:

- Interview a student and his/her family from an ethnic minority group and submit a paper on how culture impacts attitudes toward visual impairment.
- Visit a parent group meeting dealing with issues of disabilities.
- Attend a School Parent Advisory Council Meeting. Describe the participation of minority and non-minority families.
- Have students design activity for building self-esteem through a leadership opportunity (community service work; activity with other sighted students, etc.).
- Interview family from a culturally or linguistically diverse group about their expectations, values, and beliefs of the visual impairment of their child.

Readings:

Crespo, S. E. (1989). The assessment of education for the visually impaired population in Latin America. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 83(1), 7-11.

Ingstad, B. (1988). Coping behaviour of disabled persons and their families: Cross-cultural perspectives from Norway and Botswana. International Journal of Rehabilitation Research, 11(4), 351-359.

Lynch, E. W., & Hanson, M. J. (1992). Developing cross-cultural competence: A guide for working with young children and their families. Baltimore, MD: Paul Brookes.

Orlansky, M. D., & Trap, J. (1987). Working with Native Americans persons: Issues in facilitating communication and providing culturally relevant services. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 81(4), 151-155.

Swallow, R. M., & Huebner, K. M. (Eds). (1987). How to thrive, not just survive: A guide to developing independent life skills for blind and visually impaired children and youths. New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

Tuttle, D. W., & Tuttle, N. (1996). Self-esteem and adjusting to blindness (2nd ed.). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

University of Northern Colorado
Division of Special Education

Course Title: EDSE 508: Teaching Second Language Learners with Visual Impairments

Credit Hours: 3 Semester Hours

Prerequisities: Admission to the Severe Needs Vision Program or completion of program and completion of EDSE 543.

Catalog Description:

Introduction to the educational needs of students who come from culturally and linguistically diverse communities and have visual impairments. Assessment, instruction, and program modifications are discussed. Spanish braille code is introduced.

Course Description:

The purpose of this course is to introduce assessment and instructional issues related to students with visual disabilities who are in the process of learning English. It examines approaches in teaching reading, writing, oral, and listening skills to blind or visually impaired students with different levels of proficiency in English and in their native language. Students learn to use Spanish braille code to transcribe materials for their Spanish speaking students who read braille.

Student Objectives:

- Transcribe written materials in Spanish using the Spanish braille code.
- Identify the needs of students with visual disabilities who are in the process of learning English.
- Identify approaches of language teaching and examine their use with second language students with visual disabilities.
- Examine reading methods and their use with second language students with visual impairments.

Milian, M., & Ferrell, K. A. (1998). University of Northern Colorado.

- Become familiar with existing language arts materials in languages other than English and their availability for students with visual impairments.
- Review and evaluate materials and determine their use with second language students with visual disabilities.
- Examine effective teaching strategies to improve the education of second language students.

Broad Content Outline:

- Definition and incidence of language minority students, students in the process of learning English, and students with visual impairments locally and nationwide.
- Educational needs of students with different levels of English and native language fluency who have a visual disability.
- Bilingual education: What is it? How is it implemented? What is the role of the vision teacher who provides services to students who are visually impaired and attend bilingual classrooms?
- Fostering writing, reading, oral and listening skills in English and the non-English language. Implications for students who use Braille as a reading and writing mode.
- Learning to speak, read, and write in a second language. Social and individual factors influencing the learning of the second language.
- Research on issues related to the education of language minority students with disabilities.
- Availability and appropriateness of commercially available materials for students who are in the process of learning English and use large print or Braille as their reading and writing mode.

Required Readings:

Baca, L., & Almanza, E. (1991). Language minority students with disabilities. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Comite Internacional Pro Ciegos (nd). Manual de enseñanza de escritura y lectura Braille. Mexico. Author.

Library of Congress. (1990). World braille usage. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (1996). The foundations of dual language instruction (2nd ed.). White Plains: NY. Longman.

Milian, M. (1997). Teaching braille reading and writing to students who are speakers of English as a second language. In D. Wormsley & F. Mary D'Andrea (Eds.), Instructional strategies for braille literacy (pp. 130-189). New York: American Foundation for the Blind.

A Spanish/English Dictionary

Related Readings:

Articles:

Barrera, I. (1993). Effective and appropriate instruction for all children: The challenge of cultural/linguistic diversity and young children with special needs. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13(4), 461-487.

Cheng, L. L. (1987). The identification of communicative disorders in Asian-Pacific students. Journal of Childhood Communication Disorders, 13(1), 113-119.

Correa, V., & Tulbert, B. (1991) Teaching culturally diverse students. Preventing School Failure, 35(3), 20-35.

ERIC/OSEP Abstract 23, 1989. Assessing the language difficulties of Hispanic bilingual students. The Council for Exceptional Children.

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1994). The language-minority student and special education: Issues, trends, and paradoxes. Exceptional Children, 60(4), 310-322.

Goldman, S. R., & Rueda, R. (1988). Developing writing skills in bilingual exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 54(6), 543-551.

Guinan, H. (1997). ESL for students with visual impairments. Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness, 91(6), 555-563.

Harris, K., Rueda, R., & Supancheck, P. (1990). A descriptive study of literacy events in secondary special education programs in linguistically diverse schools. Remedial and Special Education, 2(4), 20-28.

Harry, B., Grenot-Scheyer, M., Smith-Lewis, M., Park, H. S., Xin, F., & Schwartz, I. (1995). Developing culturally inclusive services for individuals with severe disabilities. JASH, 20(2), 99-109.

Hosmer Rapp, W. (1997) Success with a student with limited English proficiency: One teacher's experience. Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Children, 2(1), 21-37.

Maldonado-Colón, E. (1991). Development of second language learners' linguistic and cognitive abilities. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, (9), 37-48.

Milian, M. (1996). Knowledge of basic concepts of young students with visual impairments who are monolingual or bilingual. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 90(5), 386-399.

Schiff-Myers, N. B., Djukic, J., McGovern-Lawler, J., & Perez, D. (1993). Assessment considerations in the evaluation of second-language learners: A Case Study. Exceptional Children, 60(3), 237-248.

Books or Chapters:

Baca, L., & Cervantes, H. (1998). The bilingual special education interface (3rd ed.). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Grosjean, F. (1982). The bilingual child. In F. Grosjean, Life with two languages: An introduction to bilingualism. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hamayan, E., & Damico, J. (Eds.). (1991). Limiting bias in the assessment of bilingual students. Austin, TX: PRO-ED.

Krashen S. D. (1982). Principles and practice in second language acquisition. New York: Pergamon Press.

Ortiz, A. A., & Ramirez, B. A. (1988). Schools and the culturally diverse exceptional student: Promising practices and future directions. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Padilla, A. M., Fairchild, H. H., & Valadez, C. M. (Eds.). (1990). Bilingual education: Issues and strategies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Pérez, B., & Torres-Guzmán, M. (1996). Learning in two worlds: An integrated Spanish/English biliteracy approach. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Spangenberg-Urbschat, K., & Pritchard, R. (Eds). (1994). Kids come in all languages: Reading instruction for ESL students. Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association.

Tinajero, J., & Ada, A. F. (Eds.). (1993). The power of two languages: Literacy and biliteracy for Spanish-speaking students. New York: Macmillan/McGraw Hill.

Williams, J. D., & Snipper, G. C. (1990). Literacy and Bilingualism. New York: Longman.

Recommended Journals:

Bilingual Research Journal
Exceptional Children
Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences
Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology
Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students
Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development
Language Learning
The Reading Teacher
TESOL Journal

Course Requirements:

1. Spanish braille transcriptions. (25%)

2. Read three articles related to the field of bilingual education, bilingual special education, English as a Second Language, or multicultural education. Using APA style, write an annotated bibliography summarizing each one of the articles. The summary should also include: (a) your reaction to the information provided by the author(s), and (b) how the information you learned could help you when working with students with visual disabilities. Submit a nine page double spaced type-written paper with the summary of the three articles. Also share a copy of each article with your instructor. (15%)

3. Select one of the articles you used for your annotated bibliography and present it in class. Be prepared to answer questions on how the information discussed on your presentation relates to the education of students with visual disabilities. (10%)

4. Develop a lesson you can teach to a student who is blind or visually impaired and is learning English as a new language. You will share a copy of your lesson with the class and present it. (15%)

5. Spend 10 hours working with a teacher who provides services to students who are in the process of learning English. Keep a log explaining your experiences while participating in activities with the students, families, and teacher. Include examples of the type of activities you observed. If students were not visually impaired, explain how activities could be modified to be used with students who have visual disabilities. (35%)

Evaluation/Grading:

100-90% =A
89-80% =B
79-70% =C
69-60% =D
Below 60% =F

Program Competencies Specific to the Population of Visually Impaired Students who are Members of Diverse Culture and Language Communities

I. Cultural Diversity

- Explore personal attitudes regarding culturally and linguistically diverse individuals.
- Understand the concept of diversity in its broadest sense.
- Understand the differences in various cultures regarding the acquisition of independent living skills by children.
- Understand how social and recreation skills may differ in content and importance among various cultures.
- Understand the need to be sensitive to cultural concerns.
- Understand families' views of independence as related to their cultural beliefs of child rearing.
- Identify cultural variables that may impact on the delivery of orientation and mobility services.
- Understand how family structure, roles, and responsibilities may be different according to the families' culture.
- Explore how discipline may be perceived by different cultural groups.
- Explore cultural, religious, and spiritual beliefs as coping resources.
- Understand issues of transition from school to work, and how culturally diverse families view the process.
- Understand how the families' beliefs, stigmas of visual disabilities, and treatment for children with visual impairments impact on their views of school programs. How are beliefs, stigmas, and treatment different among members of different cultures?
- Understand the medical, educational, and economic needs of families of students with visual impairments who come from linguistically diverse communities.
- Understand how blindness impacts on the family dynamics of various cultures.

II. Language Diversity

Instruction:

- Discuss issues related to the use of native language + English vs. English only with students who have visual impairments and those with multiple disabilities.
- Discuss ways to incorporate the student's native language into the educational program.
- Identify program modifications necessary when providing orientation and mobility services to students with limited knowledge of English.
- Identify how the role of Itinerant, Resource Room, and Residential School teachers can change when providing services to students who are visually impaired and are learning English as a new language.
- Identify the instructional needs of students with visual disabilities who are in the process of learning English.
- Identify approaches of language teaching and examine their use with second language students with visual disabilities.
- Examine reading methods and their use with second language students with visual impairments.
- Examine effective teaching strategies to improve the education of second language students with visual impairments.

Assessment:

- Demonstrate familiarity with assessment instruments that are available in non-English languages.
- Adapt commercially available assessments and develop strategies for assessing students who are learning English as a new language.
- Review bilingual assessments and evaluate their use with students who have visual impairments.
- Understand informal/authentic assessment strategies and their use with bilingual students who are visually impaired.

Communication:

- Transcribe written materials in Spanish using the Spanish braille code.

- Understand the advantages and disadvantages of using interpreters when communicating with non-English speaking families.
- Discuss strategies for communicating with non-English speaking families.
- Develop an understanding of communication techniques to use with parents of children with visual impairments from various cultural backgrounds.
- Demonstrate familiarity with teaming strategies for teaching and assessment.
- Familiarity with listening and communication techniques to facilitate culturally sensitive, non-judgmental home visits to build on the cultural style and needs of the families.

Technology:

- Identify available software to facilitate the teaching of English.
- Identify available software to support the teaching of the native language and languages other than English.
- Identify keyboard functions needed to write in a language other than English.
- Identify hardware with access to languages other than English.

Instructional Materials:

- Familiarity with materials procurement for students who are speakers and readers of a non-English language.
- Become familiar with existing language arts materials in languages other than English and their availability for students with visual impairments.
- Review and evaluate English as a second language materials and those written in non-English languages and determine their use with second language students with visual disabilities.

Part III:
Educating Students with Visual Impairments and Limited English Proficiency: A Survey of Educators

As part of our project, we conducted a multi-state needs assessment that was guided by the following research questions:

- How do educators rate their knowledge in areas related to their work with students who have visual impairments and are still in the process of learning English?

- What areas are identified by educators as important when working with students with visual impairments who are still in the process of learning English?

- What teaching approaches, methods, and strategies are most commonly used by educators working with students with visual impairments who are English speakers?

- What teaching approaches, methods, and strategies are most commonly used by educators working with students with visual impairments who are still in the process of learning English?

- What are the most common assessment and instructional practices taking place with students who have visual impairments and are still in the process of learning English?

When determining the research questions, we reviewed the literature related to multicultural competencies for teachers who educate children with and without disabilities (Burstein, Cabello, & Hamann, 1993; Hadaway & Florez, 1988; and Ortiz, Yates, & Garcia, 1990). We also reviewed the research literature related to studies that have investigated the knowledge and importance of multicultural competencies (Baca, Fradd, & Collier, 1990; Fradd, Algozzine, & Salend, 1988; and Hernandez von Hoff, 1992).

In addition, the members of the Advisory Committee and the Project Faculty contributed competencies that were believed to be appropriate for the population of students with visual impairments who come from culturally and linguistically diverse communities.

After a number of revisions, a pilot study was conducted with a group of teachers in Colorado. Teachers were asked to provide feedback on the format of the survey. The suggestions received from the pilot study helped us in making minor modifications to the instrument. The final version of the survey was completed by educators working with students with visual impairments in Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, New Mexico, New York, and Texas. These states were selected because of their large linguistically diverse student population. The descriptive statistics are included here. In the future, we will conduct correlation analysis and present the results in other publications and national presentations.

Program Information and Respondents' Demographics

The results reported in Table 1 reflect the actual number of educators returning the questionnaire. When the reported number is not 361, the difference indicates the number of educators who did not provide an answer for that particular item.

Table 1. Number of Educators Participating

State	N=361	Percent
Texas	100	27.7
New York	87	24.1
California	64	17.7
Arizona	38	10.5
Colorado	37	10.2
Florida	21	5.8
New Mexico	14	3.9

Table 2. Positions Held by Educators and Settings Where They Worked

Position	N=357	Percent
Teacher for the Visually Impaired	247	68.8
Teacher and O & M Instructor	44	12.3
Orientation and Mobility Instructor	28	7.8
Other*	28	7.8
Administrator	7	1.9
Teacher Educator (University)	3	.8
Settings	**N=357**	**Percent**
Itinerant Program	160	44.8
Residential School	49	13.7
Special Day School	35	9.8
Resource/Itinerant	30	8.4
Resource Room	27	7.6
Combination of Settings	24	6.6
Other	22	6.2
University	3	.8

*Some of the participants who classified themselves as "Other" included those working as Career Counselors, Transition Teachers, Family Workers, and some Preschool Teachers.

Table 3. Age of Educators

Age	N=358	Percent
Under 25	8	2.2
26-30	37	10.3
31-35	37	10.3
36-40	72	20.1
41-45	91	25.3
46-50	49	13.6
Over 50	64	17.8

Table 4. Gender of Educators

	N=356	Percent
Female	318	88.8
Male	38	10.6

Table 5. Ethnic or Racial Background of Educators

Self-Identification	N=348	Percent
African American	5	1.4
Asian American	3	.9
European American	293	84.2
Hispanic American	19	5.5
Native American*	10	2.9
Mixed Race/Ethnicity	10	2.9
Other	8	2.3

*We believe that there was some confusion among participants with the classification of Native American, which may have resulted in the overrepresentation of this group. According to the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1994), the total number of teachers belonging to American Indian communities is only 0.7%, therefore it is unlikely that 2.9% of the participants will be part of these communities. It is more likely that some respondents did not understand the difference between the classification of European American and Native American, and responded as though they were answering a question of birth right or birth place. In the future we recommend the use of the term American Indian rather than Native American.

Table 6 includes the total number of years teaching students with and without disabilities. The average number of years of teaching experience was 11. Table 7 indicates the areas of teaching certification specific to the field of teaching students with visual impairments.

Table 6. Total Number of Years Teaching

Years Teaching	N=352	Percent
1-4	101	28.6
5-9	59	16.7
10-15	68	19.3
16-20	68	19.3
21-25	40	11.3
26-30	11	3.1
31-35	5	1.5

Table 7. Educator's Areas of Certification

Certification Area	YES	NO	Number
Vision	307	51	358
Orientation & Mobility	88	264	352

It is important to remember that 247 respondents identified themselves as teachers for the visually impaired, 28 identified themselves as Orientation and Mobility instructors, and 44 were currently functioning in both positions. From the figures, it can be inferred that educators completing the survey were certified in the areas they were teaching, and that lack of appropriate certification was not an issue for this group of educators.

Table 8. Additional Certification

Additional Certification	N=285	Percent
Elementary & Special Edu.	81	28.2
Elementary Education	80	27.9
Special Education	64	22.3
Other Combination	31	10.6
Content Area Certification	24	8.4
Physical Education	5	1.7

It should be noted that 78% of educators participating in the study reported having teaching certification in other areas in addition to their certification in the area of Visual Impairments or Orientation and Mobility. This may, at least in part, explain why the majority of respondents (56.7%) were over the age of 40. It is possible that teachers are entering the field of vision after having explored and worked in other teaching areas.

Table 9. Highest Degree Earned

Degree	**N=359**	**Percent**
Bachelors	83	23.1
Masters	265	73.6
Doctorate	9	2.5
Other	2	.6

Table 10. Number of Educators Who Reported Speaking a Language Other Than English and Languages Reported Speaking

	N=358	**Percent**
Only Speaks English	192	53.6
Speaks another Language	166	46.4
Language Spoken	**N=160**	**Percent**
Spanish	94	58.4
French	18	11.2
Sign Language	11	6.8
Combination of Languages	11	6.8
German	8	5.0
Italian	5	3.1
Hebrew	4	2.5
Other Languages*	4	2.5
Danish	2	1.2
Chinese	1	.6
Russian	1	.6
Swedish	1	.6

*The classification of other was given to languages that generated only one response and were infrequently spoken in the United States.

In addition to asking participants the language they spoke, they were also asked to rate their proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing in those languages. They rated these four language areas using a five point rating scale which included the following classifications: very low, somewhat low, average, proficient, and highly proficient.

Reported Proficiency Rating of Languages Spoken by Educators

Listening **N=164**

Very Low				Highly Proficient
8 (4.9%)	46 (28%)	**49 (29.9%)**	34 (20.7%)	27 (16.5%)

Speaking **N=164**

Very Low				Highly Proficient
9 (5.5%)	48 (29.3%0	**50 (30.5%)**	40 (24.4%)	17 (10.4%)

Reading **N=155**

Very Low				Highly Proficient
11 (7.1%)	37 (23.9%)	**47 (30.3%)**	38 (24.5%)	22 (14.2%)

Writing **N=155**

Very Low				Highly Proficient
24 (15.5%)	45 (29%)	**51 (32.9%)**	22 (14.2)%)	13 (8.4%)

With 361 educators participating in the study, these data mean that 30% of respondents rated their listening skills in another language as average or better; 29% in speaking; 29% in reading and 23% in writing. It is thus estimated that about 23 to 30% of the educators who participated in this study had the ability to facilitate instruction in a language other than English when the non-English language they know and the student's non-English language coincide. However, since matching students' and teachers' languages may not be possible in the real life situation of schools, we can at least say that 166 (46%) of the participating educators have personally experienced the process of learning a second language and may be able to understand the needs of students who are learning English as a new language.

Table 11. Training Related to Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students and Type of Training

	N=350	Percent
No Training	189	53.7
Received Training	161	45.7
Type of Training	**N=154**	**Percent**
School District Inservice	71	45.8
University Course	59	38.1
Inservice and University	15	9.7
Degree in Related Areas	3	1.9
Readings	3	1.9
In Vision and O&M Prog.	3	1.9

Table 12. Number of Respondents Working with Students Who Come from Homes Where Languages Other than English are Spoken

	N=319	Percent of Total
Served Students from Homes Where Languages Other than English are Spoken	256	80.2
Served Students who are Limited English Proficient	140	43.8

Three hundred and nineteen educators provided the total number of students they worked with. Two hundred and fifty-six teachers (80.2% of respondents) worked with students who came from homes where languages other than English were spoken. Of these 256 educators, 140 (43.8% of respondents) were working with students who were classified as having limited proficiency in English.

Information About Students

Participants were asked to provide information about the number of students they were currently working with, and to provide specific information about those students regarding disabilities and language status. Three hundred and nineteen teachers provided information about their students. These teachers reported working with a total of 4,640 students (mean=14.5). Teachers reported working with 1,267 students who came from homes where a language other than English was spoken (27.3% of all students), and 382 students who were in the process of learning English (8.2% of the total number of students served). It is important to note that 30.1% of students who come from homes where a language other than English is spoken are still classified as having limited proficiency in English.

Given the demographics of the states where the study was conducted, the figure we obtained identifying the number of students from homes where a language other than English is spoken is probably accurate. However, since the study included many of the states with high numbers of students with limited English proficiency, the figure obtained for students who were still in the process of learning English is most likely an underrepresentation of the population. One factor that leads us to believe that the 8.2% is an underrepresentation of the population of students with limited proficiency in English is the fact that many educators simply stated that they did not know if their students were still classified as limited English proficient. Another factor pointing to possible underrepresentation of the population is the discrepancy between the number of infants and preschool students reported living in homes where a language other than English is spoken and the limited proficient count in the same age category. Educators reported working with a total of 203 infants and preschoolers, including children with visual impairments and visual multiple disabilities, birth to five years old. However, they only reported 85 students in the limited English proficient count. It is unlikely that children five years old and younger will obtain enough proficiency in English to be classified as English speakers. Tables 12 and 13 provide information related to students.

Table 13. Information About Students
N=319

Classification of Students	Number	Percent
Visually Impaired Students	2,075	44.7% of total
VI-Homes Other Than English (H.T.E.)	621	29.9% of V.I.
VI-Limited English Proficient (LEP)	156	25.1% of V.I. from H.T.E.
Visually Imp./Multiple Disab. Students	2,565	55.3% of total
VIM/Homes Other Than English(H.T.E.)	646	25.1% of V.I.M
VIM/Limited English Proficient (LEP)	226	34.9% of V.I.M. from H.T.E.

Table 14. Numbers of Students by Age, Disability, and Language Category

Age	Language and Disability Categories					
	V.I. Only	V.I.M.	V.I. HTE	V.I.M. H.T.E.	V.I. LEP	V.I.M. LEP
0-36 mo.	91	206	23	31	13	15
3-5 yrs	188	338	54	95	26	31
5-8 yrs	329	522	98	137	34	48
8-12 yrs	508	520	137	131	23	54
12-15 yrs	442	425	95	120	20	32
15-18 yrs	439	382	174	110	36	40
18+ yrs	78	172	40	22	4	6
Totals	**2,075**	**2,565**	**621**	**646**	**156**	**226**

When examining the percentage of students with additional disabilities by age groups, the proportion of students with disabilities in addition to a visual impairment is inversely related to age. The younger age categories have a greater proportion of students with visual and multiple disabilities (69.4% at 0-36 months) than do the older age categories(46.5% at age 15-18 years). This finding supports perceptions of increasing numbers of children with multiple disabilities. The spike of multiple disabilities at 18+ years (68.8%) most likely reflects the number of students with multiple disabilities maintained in school programs.

We provided educators with a list of twenty-four items that we determined were important when working with linguistically diverse students with visual impairments. Educators were asked to rate their knowledge of each item and the importance of the item when working with linguistically and culturally diverse students with visual impairments. The rating scale for the knowledge items ranged from 1 (Not Satisfactory) to 4 (Highly Satisfactory), therefore, a mean closer to 1 than to 4 indicates a lower level of knowledge on a particular item. The importance items ranged from 0 (Don't Know) to 4 (Highly Important), and thus, a mean closer to 4 than to 0 indicates that educators rated the item as important. Table 15 provides the mean and the rank obtained for each item. A copy of the survey is included in the appendix.

When observing the knowledge ratings provided by the participants, it should be noted that only two items had means that were located between satisfactory and highly satisfactory, fifteen items had means between somewhat satisfactory and satisfactory, and seven items had means between not satisfactory and somewhat satisfactory. The ratings provided by participants related to the importance of the items indicate that seventeen of the items had means between average importance to highly important, and only seven were rated between the somewhat important to average importance. It appears that while teachers were not overwhelmingly satisfied with their knowledge, they did indeed recognize the importance of most of the items

Table 15. Rating of Educators' Knowledge on Selected Items and Their Importance When Working with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Visual Impairments.

Knowledge			Importance	
Mean	**Rank**		**Mean**	**Rank**
1.98	19	Federal, state, and district regulations (including testing and placement) related to LEP students.	2.74	20
1.90	23	Historical, legal, and educational bases for the establishment of support programs for LEP students.	2.94	19
2.06	12	Teaching techniques effective with LEP students.	3.32	4
2.03	14	Basic concepts of second language acquisition.	3.10	16
2.03	15	Availability of print, braille, records, and film materials that will support the teaching of English.	3.24	8
1.99	17	Assessment issues related to LEP students.	3.14	12
1.72	24	Foreign language braille, particularly Spanish braille.	2.45	23
1.99	18	Curriculum modifications that will promote academic growth for LEP students.	3.10	15

Knowledge			**Importance**	
Mean	**Rank**		**Mean**	**Rank**
1.90	22	Historical background of different cultural groups represented by the students in your caseload.	2.40	24
1.96	20	Understanding of teaching strategies used by bilingual educators and ESL teachers.	2.94	18
2.09	11	Knowledge and strategies to enhance cross-cultural communication with LEP students and their families.	3.12	13
2.36	7	Cultural perceptions of visual disabilities, particularly in cultures represented in your caseload.	3.29	5
2.33	8	Familiarity with cultural variables that could influence the learning process.	3.22	9
2.15	10	Strategies to work collaboratively with families from diverse cultures and language groups.	3.20	11
2.16	9	Familiarity with the language or languages spoken by students in your caseload.	3.01	17
2.00	16	Working knowledge of at least one language in addition to English.	2.59	21

Knowledge			Importance	
Mean	Rank		Mean	Rank
2.72	4	Effective use of translators or interpreters to communicate with families.	3.41	3
2.51	6	Working in collaboration with a bilingual paraprofessional to foster the academic and language skills of LEP students.	3.21	10
2.53	5	Working in collaboration with bilingual and/or ESL teachers.	3.27	6
1.92	21	Familiarity with research related to students from diverse cultures and language groups with or without disabilities.	2.58	22
2.04	13	Familiarity with the differences between a language disability and the normal process of second language acquisition.	3.11	14
2.72	3	Understanding of the cultures and traditions of students in your caseload.	3.24	7
3.35	1	Understanding the impact of teacher expectation on student performance.	3.58	1
3.07	2	Creating a supportive learning environment that will value the cultural and language diversity of students.	3.52	2

We also asked participants to indicate how often they used a number of teaching approaches, methods, and strategies in their teaching settings. The rating scale allowed teachers to indicate if they were not familiar with the approach and if the approach was not applicable to their teaching situation. Participants were asked to rate the same approach and its use with English speaking children with visual impairments and those who were still in the process of learning English as a second language. The rating scale included the following ratings: 0=not familiar with the item, 1=never, 2=monthly, 3=weekly, and 4=daily. Additionally, respondents also had the option of selecting NA when the item was not applicable to their setting. Table 16 provides the information related to specific strategies used with English speaking students who are visually impaired, and Table 17 provides the information for practices used with visually impaired students who are learning English as a new language.

Table 16. Percent of Respondents Reporting Using Specific Strategies and Approaches with English Speaking Students with Visual Impairments

Approach and Strategy	N	D.K.	Never	At least Monthly	NA
Basal readers	336	2.6	11.3	39.2	46.7
Language Experience Approach	329	4.5	2.1	67.1	26.1
Literature Approach	330	4.2	3.6	57.2	34.8
Collaborative Story Writing	331	3.3	7.5	46.5	42.5
Phonics-Based Instruction	333	1.5	6.3	53.4	38.7
Peer Tutoring	331	2.4	7.5	52.2	37.7
Cooperative Learning	329	5.7	3.6	58.0	32.5
One-on-one Direct Instruction	337	0.2	1.1	91.3	7.1
Small Group Instruction	331	1.8	8.4	63.1	26.5
Whole Language	325	4.9	5.8	61.8	27.3
Patterns Reading Series	334	4.7	10.7	39.8	44.6

Taking the information provided by the participants on the frequency in which they used the approaches and strategies mentioned above, we can make the following statements on their use with English speaking students with visual impairments:

•More respondents stated that Basal Readers and Patterns Reading Series were not applicable to their teaching situation (46.7% and 44.6%) than those who stated using them at least monthly (39.2% and 39.8%).

•Respondents reported using Language Experiece Approach (67.1%) and One-on-one Direct Instruction (91.3%) much more frequently than any other approach or strategy.

•Except for Basal Readers, Patterns Reading Series, and Collaborative Story Writing, all other approaches and strategies were being used by more than 50% of the respondents.

Table 17. Percent of Respondents Reporting Using Specific Strategies and Approaches with Limited English Proficient Students with Visual Impairments

Approach and Strategy	N	DK	Never	At Least Monthly	NA
Basal readers	314	3.5	9.2	18.4	68.7
Language Experience Approach	310	4.5	3.5	42.5	49.3
Literature Approach	312	2.8	5.1	31.0	60.8
Collaborative Story Writing	311	2.2	8.0	24.7	64.9
Phonics-Based Instruction	313	1.9	5.4	29.3	63.2
Peer Tutoring	316	3.1	5.3	34.1	57.2
Cooperative Learning	317	5.0	3.7	38.4	52.6
One-on-one Direct Instruction	317	1.2	1.2	61.8	35.6
Small Group Instruction	317	1.8	5.0	41.3	51.7
Whole Language	311	4.8	4.1	35.0	55.3
Patterns Reading Series	312	4.8	9.9	16.9	68.2

Given the responses provided by the participants related to the use of teaching approaches and methods when working with students with visual impairments who are still in the process of learning English, the following statements can be made about the use of the mentioned approaches and strategies:

- Except for One-on-one Direct Instruction, all other approaches and strategies had a larger proportion of respondents in the not applicable category.
- Basal Readers (18.4%) and Patterns Reading Series (16.9%) were the least used approaches.
- One-on-one Direct Instruction (61.8%), Language Experience Approach (42.5%), and Small Group Instruction (41.3%) were the most commonly used approaches.

In order to compare the similarities and differences between the approaches and strategies used with the English speaking group and the group of students with limited proficiency in English, we computed the number and percentage of educators using these approaches by subtracting the answers from those respondents who stated that items were not applicable to their teaching situation. By recalculating the frequency using only those respondents who did not consider the approach or strategy not being appropriate to their setting, we can estimate the use of these approaches among the group of educators who actually use them. Table 18 provides this information.

Table 18. Number and Percent of Reported Use of Approaches and Strategies with English Speaking and Limited English Proficient Students with Visual Impairments

	English Speaking Vis. Imp.			LEP Visually Impaired		
Approach & Strategy	**N and Percent**	**DK or Never**	**At least Monthly**	**N and Percent**	**DK or Never**	**At least Monthly**
Basal readers	179	47	132	98	40	58
	53.2	26.2	73.7	31.2	40.8	59.1
Language Experience Approach	243	22	221	157	25	132
	73.8	9.0	90.9	50.6	15.9	84.0
Literature Approach	215	26	189	122	25	97
	65.1	12.0	87.9	39.1	20.4	79.5
Collaborative Story Writing	190	36	154	109	32	77
	57.4	18.9	81.0	35.0	29.3	70.6
Phonics-Based Instruction	204	26	178	115	23	92
	61.2	12.7	87.2	36.7	20.0	80.0
Peer Tutoring	206	33	173	135	27	108
	62.2	16.0	83.9	42.7	20.0	80.0
Cooperative Learning	222	31	191	150	28	122
	67.4	13.9	86.0	47.3	18.6	81.3
One-on-one Direct Instruction	313	5	308	204	8	196
	98.2	1.5	98.4	64.3	3.9	96.0

Approach & Strategy	N and Percent	DK or Never	At least monthly	N and Percent	DK or Never	At least monthly
Small Group Instruction	243	34	209	153	22	131
	73.4	13.9	86.0	48.2	14.3	85.6
Whole Language	236	35	201	137	28	109
	72.6	14.8	85.1	44.0	20.4	79.5
Patterns Reading-Series	185	52	133	99	46	53
	55.3	28.1	71.8	31.7	46.4	53.5

From these data, it appears that educators were less inclined to use specific methods with limited English proficient students and more inclined to use them with English speaking students. At least a five point difference was found in the use of the following approaches and strategies:

- Basal Readers (used 14.6% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Language Experience Approach (used 6.9% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Literature Approach (used 8.4% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Collaborative Story Writing (used 10.4% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Phonics-Based Instruction (used 7.2% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Whole Language (used 5.6% more frequently with English speaking students).
- Patterns Reading Series (used 18.3% more frequently with English speaking students).

Two open-ended questions related to teaching approaches and strategies were included so that educators could include additional information on the specific teaching approaches they use with English speaking and limited English proficient visually impaired students. The responses provided by educators were grouped into themes or categories. The themes and responses that constituted each particular category are explained as follows:

Please tell us about other teaching approaches, methods, and strategies you are using with your English speaking students with visual impairments.

Category	**Responses**
No response	**209**

This included respondents who did not provide an answer, or indicated that everything was already included in the survey.

Category	**Responses**
Miscellaneous	**55**

This category included responses that did not fit into other themes and there were too few responses to constitute a new category.

Some of the responses included in the miscellaneous category included:

- *Itinerant teachers do not choose the curriculum.*
- *I have only been teaching visually impaired students for one month.*
- *Inclusion, job shadowing.*
- *I use trial and error.*
- *I do consult work with most of my students.*
- *Learning techniques from cognitive science such as mind mapping, chunking, visual icons, and mental imagery.*

Category	**Responses**
Tactual discrimination, concept development, and sensory stimulation.	**27**

Responses in this category included:

- *I use Mangold and Oakmont materials.*
- *We use prebraille activities from Patterns and from Staff generated checklists.*
- *Sensory stimulation using lightbox activities, and Patterns.*
- *PREP program.*

•I am currently teaching an adventitiously blind student to read braille using a reading program called "Braille Too."
•I work with multihandicapped students birth to 21 years. Basically, I work on vision stimulation.

Category	**Responses**
Hands-on activities, experiential learning, and use of concrete materials.	**23**

Some of the responses included in this category were:
•My teaching experience has been only with younger, preschool age VH and MH children where you use concrete materials, simplified language, and familiar and daily routine activities.
•Hands-on experiential activities in classroom, school, and surrounding neighborhood.
•Hands-on, tactual storybooks, and concrete objects.
•Provide experience to support lessons I attempt.
•We do reading and writing based on experiences.

Category	**Responses**
Computer instruction and use of technology.	**15**

Some of the responses included in this category were:
•My emphasis is in the area of computers and technology for VI students.
•We use large print computer programs.
•Computer assisted technology.
•We use talking computer programs.
•Computer with large print and speech, software that allows each letter, word and sentence to be spoken out loud.

Category	**Responses**
Direct instruction and individualized instruction.	**11**

Examples of responses included in this category were:
•I use direct instruction from my LH background.

- *My program is highly individualized. I do considerable informal and instantaneous evaluation. Therefore, I modify my approaches, methods, and strategies on an ongoing basis.*
- *I have developed a model for teaching braille based on the Direct Instruction teaching method.*
- *Because of the great range in age and handicapping conditions, my instructional approaches also differ widely tailored to each individual student.*

Category	**Responses**
One on one and use of materials developed for students' needs.	**9**

Some of the responses included in this category were:

- *I do lots of one on one with adaptive equipment.*
- *One on one to reinforce skills or work within classroom to be sure student understands.*
- *I use many teacher constructed worksheets.*

Category	**Responses**
Multi-sensory approach, use of books on tape, and teaching orally.	**7**

Examples of responses in this category included:

- *Use of braille books, books on tape, and reading to students.*
- *Instruction through the auditory mode.*
- *Multi-sensory approach to learning.*

Category	**Responses**
Whole language, literature based, LEA, and thematic approach.	**7**

Responses in this category included:

- *I use a whole language approach.*
- *Use of thematic approach.*

•Literature based with cooperative learning. I also use cross curriculum connections and strategies to develop critical thinking. I use an integrated approach in math with emphasis on manipulatives.

Please tell us about other teaching approaches, methods, and strategies you are using with LEP students with visual impairments.

Category	**Responses**
No response	**208**

This included respondents who did not provide an answer, or indicated that everything was already included in the survey.

Category	**Responses**
None or No LEP Students	**43**

These respondents either indicated that they were not using any specific strategies with their LEP students or that they did not have any LEP students at the present time.

Category	**Responses**
Using students' native language, translators, bilingual paraprofessionals, or volunteers.	**27**

Examples of responses that were included into this category were:

•We teach very much the same, translating as necessary. I always have a bilingual aide available.

•We use English and translate to Spanish for understanding.

•I have volunteer high school students earning social service credits who know some Spanish working after school with my Spanish LEP students.

•If unsure of English comprehension, I say things in both English and Spanish to make clearer and to teach the English way to say it.

•Use dominant language for instruction or reinforcement as determined by the special education committee after an appropriate assessment.

- *Using paraprofessionals to interpret during the lesson.*

Category **Responses**
Use of concrete objects, hands-on activities, and experiential learning. **23**

Responses illustrating this category included:
- *We do lots of language experience and specific vocabulary work in conjunction with ESL teacher.*
- *We work in real environments with concrete connections to work and abstractions.*
- *Both for English and LEP students skills are infused into meaningful activities.*
- *They need hands on teaching.*
- *Use lots of activities and travel to establish a broader language base.*

Category **Responses**
Music and listening activities using tape recorder. **9**

Some examples of responses in this category included:
- *We use phonics tapes, stories, songs and try to encourage language in English and Spanish.*
- *Sing in their native language as well as English. Choose songs with easy words. Teach vocabulary through the motivation of instruments, songs and song games.*
- *Music is another great way we use to build language.*

Category **Responses**
Miscellaneous **8**

This category included responses that did not fit into any given theme and there were too few responses to constitute a category.

Responses illustrating this category included:

- *I use literature in Spanish (not translated English literature) and Patterns reading series at the same time. Always checking for understanding.*
- *I like to use whole language.*
- *I use Mangold to reinforce letters.*
- *Using a large print dictionary to look up meanings of words. Underline a word you don't know the meaning of. Use a word in sentences using two different meanings, two sentences for the same word.*
- *We write 5-10 words daily. Use each word in simple sentences and provide instruction on basic grammar.*

Category	**Responses**
Use of ESL materials and collaboration with ESL instructor.	**7**

Examples of responses that were assigned to this category include:

- *When I work with a LEP VI student..........I often interact with the ESL teacher for advice.*
- *Use of some ESL materials where appropriate.*
- *Use of adapted ESL materials.*
- *At this point I only have one LEP student with a visual impairment.......I utilize the help of the ESL teacher while working with this student.*

Category	**Responses**
Use of technology	**7**

Responses in this category included:

- *Much multi-media use.*
- *........using large print word processor and an IBM/Macintosh computer.*
- *We use computer assisted technology (switches, voice, pictures).*
- *Computer program, English and Spanish, from San Diego State University Bilingual Instruction technology, BIT disks. We also use word processors in Spanish, different schools have different types.*

Category	**Responses**
Use of ESL strategies	**5**

The following responses illustrate this category:

- *Sheltered English, physical response training, preview/review, modeling, realia, and other methodologies and ESL approaches.*
- *I read material more slowly, and explain any unfamiliar or difficult words.*
- *Sheltered English techniques such as speaking more slowly to students, and using simple words and always objects to hold and examine.*

Category	**Responses**
Peer tutoring and cooperative learning.	**5**

Examples of this category included:

- *I also use peer tutors who speak the same language if available.*
- *Using other students is very helpful with LEP students.*
- *Cooperative learning and using peers to explain concepts and meaning.*

In addition to the responses grouped into categories, twenty-nine responses provided by teachers did not relate to strategies used with this population. Therefore, they were not included in one of the categories.

Educators were also asked to indicate what they knew related to the assessment and instructional practices for visually impaired students who were still considered to have limited proficiency in English. Using a rating scale that included 0=Don't Know, 1=Never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Frequently, and 4=Always, they were asked to circle the frequency which most accurately described the testing and instructional practices in their setting. Table 19 reflects the percent of responses obtained for each instructional practice, and Table 20 reflects the percent of responses obtained for assessment practices.

Table 19. Percent of Responses Indicating Instructional Practices for Students with Limited Proficiency in English who are Visually Impaired

Instructional Practice	N	0 DK	1 Never	2-3 S.T./Freq.	4 Alw.
Instruction is provided in English only.	296	17.5	18.9	51.3	12.1
Instruction is provided in the native language in addition to English.	301	17.2	9.9	59.7	12.9
Professionally trained translators are used.	301	25.9	29.2	40.1	4.6
Bilingual paraprofessionals are used.	303	16.5	9.5	58.4	15.5
Braille is available in the native language.	291	35.3	27.8	29.1	7.5
ESL instruction is provided by certified ESL teacher.	317	18.2	11.6	30.5	39.4
Vision teachers, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together.	305	8.8	5.9	52.0	33.1

When examining the responses provided by the participating educators related to current instructional practices used the students with limited proficiency in English who are visually impaired, the following conclusions can be made:

- Instruction provided in English only: Seventeen percent of the educators did not know; 18.9% reported that this was never done in their setting, and 63.4% reported that this was done at least sometimes.

•Instruction provided in the native language in addition to English: Seventeen percent of the educators did not know; 9.9% reported that this was never done in their setting, and 72.6% reported that this was done at least sometimes.

•Use of professionally trained translators: Twenty five percent of the participants reported not knowing if this was done; 29.2% stated that this was never done in their setting, and 44.7% indicated that this was done at least sometimes.

•Use of bilingual paraprofessionals: Sixteen percent of the participants reported not knowing if bilingual paraprofessionals were used for instruction; 9.5% reported that this was never done in their setting, and 73.9% indicated that this was done at least sometimes.

•Availability of braille in the native language for instruction: Thirty five percent of the respondents indicated that they did not know; 27.8% stated that this was never done, and 36.6% indicated that this was done at least sometimes.

•English as a Second Language instruction provided by certified ESL teacher: Eighteen percent of educators indicated that they did not know; 11.6% stated that this was never the case, and 69.9% indicated that this done at least sometimes .

•Teachers for the visually impaired, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together: Eight percent of the educators reported that they did not know if this took place; 5.9% indicated that this never took place, and 85.1% indicated that this was done at least sometimes.

Table 20. Percent of Responses Indicating Assessment Practices for Students with Limited Proficiency in English who are Visually Impaired

Assessment Practice	N	0 DK	1 Never	2-3 S.T./Freq.	4 Alw.
LEP students are tested by bilingual psychologists or evaluators.	322	26.0	9.6	35.7	28.5
Assessment is provided in English only.	319	25.0	26.9	38.5	9.4
Assessment is provided in the native language in addition to English.	322	23.6	5.5	53.6	17.0
Professionally trained translators are used.	320	30.6	19.6	41.5	8.1
Bilingual paraprofessionals are used.	320	24.6	10.6	50.5	14.0
Braille is available in the native language.	310	43.5	28.3	21.2	6.7
LEP students are only tested orally because of lack of available tests in their native language.	314	53.1	14.0	29.8	2.8
Vision teachers, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together.	306	12.7	7.5	48.2	31.3

When examining the responses provided by educators related to assessment practices with the population of students with visual impairments who are still learning English, we can provide the following conclusions:

- Students with limited English proficiency are tested by bilingual psychologists or evaluators: Twenty six percent of the participants indicated that they did not know; 9.6% reported that this never takes place, and 64.2% reported that this is at least done sometimes.
- Assessment provided in English only: Twenty five percent of the educators reported not knowing; 26.9% indicated that this was never the case, and 47.9% indicated that this is at least done sometimes.
- Assessment provided in the native language in addition to English: Twenty three percent of the participants reported not knowing; 5.5% indicated that this was never the case, and 70.6% indicated that this is at least done sometimes.
- Use of professionally trained translators are used for assessment: Thirty percent of the participants indicated not knowing; 19.6% reported that this was never done, 49.6% stated that this was at least done sometimes.
- Use of bilingual paraprofessionals for assessment: Twenty four percent of the educators reported not knowing; 10.6% reported that this never took place, and 64.5% stated that this was at least done sometimes.
- Availability of braille in the native language: Forty three percent of the participants reported not knowing; 28.3% indicated that this was never the case, and 27.9% stated that this was at least done sometimes.
- Limited English proficient students are only tested orally because of lack of available test in their native languages: Fifty three percent of the participants indicated that they did not know; 14% reported that this is never the case, and 32.6% indicated that this is at least done sometimes.
- Vision teacher, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together: Twelve percent of the participants indicated not knowing; 7.5% stated that this was never the case, and 79.5% reported that this was at least done sometimes.

In Table 21 we find a comparison of the responses provided by respondents related to the assessment and instructional practices taking place in their settings with students with visual impairments who are still in the process of learning English.

Table 21. Percent of Reported Assessment and Instructional Practices with Students with Visual Impairments who are Learning English as a Second Language

Assessment					**Instruction**			
DK	**Never**	**S-F**	**A**		**DK**	**Never**	**S-F**	**A**
26.0	9.6	35.7	28.5	LEP students are tested by bilingual psychologists or evaluators.				
25.0	26.9	38.5	9.4	Assessment and instruction provided in English only.	17.5	18.9	51.3	12.1
23.6	5.5	53.6	17.0	Assessment and instruction provided in the native language in addition to English.	17.2	9.9	59.7	12.9
30.6	19.6	41.5	8.1	Professionally trained translators are used.	25.9	29.2	40.1	4.6
24.6	10.6	50.5	14.0	Bilingual paraprofessionals are used.	16.5	9.5	58.4	15.5
43.5	28.3	21.2	6.7	Braille is available in the native language.	35.3	27.8	29.1	7.5
53.1	14.0	29.8	2.8	LEP students are only tested orally because of lack of available tests in their native language.				
				ESL instruction is provided by certified ESL teacher.	18.2	11.6	30.5	39.4

DK	Never	S-F	A		DK	Never	S-F	A
12.7	7.5	48.2	31.3	Vision teachers, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together.	8.8	5.9	52.0	33.1

When examining the responses provided by educators, it is interesting to note the percentage of educators who responded not knowing if the assessment or instructional practices were available to students with limited English proficiency in their school districts or programs. For example, in three out of the eight items related to assessment, most educators indicated not knowing. This was also the case in two out of seven items in the instruction category. The fact that many of the educators were not aware of current practices with ESL students who are visually impaired limits our ability to correctly predict the frequency in which these practices are available to students. Furthermore, the same fact indicates that in many cases educators may not be in a position to advocate for the rights of visually impaired students who have limited proficiency in English simply because they are not aware of services that are available or that need to be available for these students.

The last part of the survey contained four open ended questions. These questions allowed educators to specifically address their concerns related to the education of linguistically diverse learners with visual impairments in their school district or program. After reading all the answers provided for each of the individual questions, responses were clustered into categories that appeared to address the same concern. Given the length of the responses, we are only able to share with you the categories, the number of responses that addressed that issue as important, and examples that illustrate the categories. Many participants identified more than one concern in one given question, and thus the number of concerns does not equal the total number of participants.

Question #1

What other areas do you perceive to be important when working with students with visual disabilities and their families who are in the process of learning English?

Category	**Responses**
Cultural and language differences affecting families.	**104**

To include: Cultural sensitivity of interpretations surrounding visual impairments; cultural issues related to families' interpretation of United States cultural rules; families interpretations of information related by school personnel; use of interpreters and translators for families; assistance in obtaining services not directly related to school program; assistance for families when completing paper work; participation in school activities for non-English speaking families; partnerships between families and schools; and family education issues.

The following responses illustrate this category:

- *Having bilingual interpreters available. Understanding cultural interpretation of vision problems.*
- *Cultural differences in how they view and deal with disabilities. Knowing how to help families access support systems and services.*
- *Parents need classes in English and how to deal with health, school, government, and other English services. Rules of our culture -- do's and don'ts --more emphasis on making parents aware of our unifying English culture.*
- *Convincing the family that it is important for everyone to learn English and that sending their children to school is important.*
- *Encourage these families to participate in school activities in spite of the language impediments.*
- *Meeting with the families to establish rapport and help them to become more involved in their children academic and skills learning abilities.*

- *Understanding parent's perception about why their child is visually impaired and how it affects the way they see their child.*
- *The area that is important is making sure the parents understand the disabilities and how we are going to educate the student and parents so we can have a better working and learning environment.*

Category	**Responses**
No response	**81**

This included respondents who indicated that they did have additional concerns, or that everything was already included in the survey.

Category	**Responses**
Language and Vision Concerns	**46**

To include: General issues in bilingual education; using interpreters with students; English only issues; use of primary language for instruction; vocabulary development; braille issues; non-English speaking parents unable to help students with homework; bilingual resources needed for assessment; non-visual bilingual materials needed for instruction; consistency of program.

Responses that illustrate this category include:

- *The diversity of the languages -- I have students who speak Urdu, Vietnamese, Sign Language, and Spanish. Money for interpreters is always a concern.*
- *For the very young, is it confusing to teach concepts to a totally blind child in a second language if he is not proficient in it?*
- *English for other family members so they can provide follow through in the home environment.*
- *It is very difficult for families to try to learn English and at the same time braille, in English, so they can help their children.*
- *Available materials in other than English languages in print, large print, and braille. Having a bilingual professional or paraprofessional in addition to ESL teacher.*

- *The understanding that English only is not the best way to go sometimes.*
- *Reading instruction (whether it should be in English or in the primary language) seems like an important question to me.*
- *If the student reads in braille, it is especially important to get the parents involved in the child's learning.*
- *Need testing materials and strategies.*

Category	**Responses**
Attitudes and barriers	**42**

To include: Awareness and respect for non-English speaking families and preparation of teachers.

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

- *I think it is important to have a general understanding of the cultural background of the family and to be familiar with its implications for their attitudes toward visual impairment and other handicaps.*
- *Good rapport; trust.*
- *Understanding cultural differences.*
- *Most important is to establish trust.*
- *Cultural sensitivity! I try to learn a few words in their native language whether it's Creole or Yiddish; familiarize myself with their customs and traditions; ask them to share any information which might help me understand and respect their culture.*
- *Teacher educated on instructional and evaluative techniques, positive attitude, collaborative teaching and communication with home.*
- *Background in a second language. Maybe even vacationing in the country where the student is from, or getting to know about the country are very important.*
- *Communication, possibility of learning their native language.*
- *Understanding cultural values that are different from your own.*
- *You must have respect for their culture.*
- *I feel that it is very important to learn about the customs and culture of all the students. It will help if you have the opportunity*

to visit or read and connect with persons who are Russians, Vietnamese, Iranian, etc.

•To know the roles of family members-who is in charge? To know what is acceptable in their culture, i.e. eye contact, hand shaking, etc.

Category	**Responses**
Need for medical, counseling, or other related services for students and families.	**12**

To include: Genetic counseling; family counseling; O&M services; bilingual paraprofessional for students; and bilingual vocational education.

The following responses illustrate this category:

•Parents and students need to talk about their ideas/misconceptions about the cause of the visual problems. Superstition and misconceptions must be put to rest so that they understand the physical condition. If genetic in nature, appropriate counseling is advised.

•They do not have enough money or knowledge to make sure their child has glasses.

•I feel that qualified interpreters are important for much instruction such as O&M.

•I feel a bilingual aide and a bilingual psychologist are essential.

•Counseling of families to assist in reducing the stress of varying attitudes toward education of children with special needs.

•The need to concentrate on vocational education and transition to higher education.

•Linking families with educational community and financial resources.

Category	**Responses**
Miscellaneous	**10**

To include: Transportation issues; mainstreaming opportunities; support for families; and communication.

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

•*Mainstream opportunities irregardless of ESOL level (as appropriate).*

•*Parents have transportation problems.*

•*My student is placed in regular classes with minimal support provided in understanding the vocabulary and concepts provided in those classes.*

•*A support system for the family.*

•*Being able to communicate with my LEP students.*

In addition to the responses explained above, we were unable to classify five responses because they were either unclear or we were not able to place them into a category.

Question #2

What specific activities, skills, and knowledge have helped you the most when working with students with visual disabilities and their families who are in the process of learning English? Please feel free to share specific instructional strategies, materials, activities, etc.

Category	Responses
No response	**183**

This included responses that stated they did not know, or those that stated that everything was already covered in the survey.

Category	Responses
Use of specialized materials or techniques	**52**

To include: singing and repetition techniques; peer tutoring, use of culturally relevant materials; community based experiences; language master; computers; and ESL techniques.

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

- *When situations allow, use English and the student's native language, use pictures, objects, etc.*
- *Hand over hand motoring, while speaking English and Spanish to student.*
- *We sing, chant, and read very simple stories (like Brown Bear that are repetitive). We try to teach English by talking about what we are doing and provide as many experiences and objects as possible.*
- *Learning experience books; simple instruction; simplify materials; have materials that are interesting, creative, and relevant to children. Be positive and give praise for all efforts accomplished.*
- *Purchase ESL materials and have a braillest who knows Spanish braille.*
- *Bilingual computer translation devices to assist in communication when a bilingual person isn't available.*
- *Learning about second language acquisition. Peer tutoring has worked very well. I try to pair a new ESL student with one who is not proficient in both languages. Computer programs.*
- *I have found it helpful to compile a list of Spanish mobility cards which I wrote on index cards and carry with me on lessons. I have also utilized English/Spanish mobility books.*
- *One activity my students enjoy is the Language Master. This allows LEP students and monolingual English speaking students to work together and receive mutual educational benefits.*

Category	**Responses**
School and family support	**37**

To include: notes home in native language; parent involvement in school setting and field trips; sharing cultural information with other teachers; and home visits.

Responses illustrating this category include:

- *To inservice the family prior to their child's IEP so that they can make logical and reasonable decisions regarding the child's goals.*
- *Keeping frequent contact with the families, face to face or by phone. Organizing seminars to talk about blindness and its effect in*

families. Translating basic information about blindness and ways in which family members can help the blind person.

- *Home visits and inviting families to my home. Field trips to build experience base and vocabulary. We went weekly to stables (animals), post office, everywhere and anywhere!*
- *I have found that sharing my own strategies for learning a second language and being very culturally aware has enhanced my relationship with my students and their families.*
- *I bought a translator program that interprets letters from English to Spanish. I use it weekly to communicate suggestions and instructions.*
- *Materials sharing with regular ESOL instructor.*
- *Have notes sent home in their language to make sure they understand the information.*

Category	**Responses**
Use of translators, bilingual classroom assistants, and bilingual professionals.	**31**

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

- *I ask for help repeatedly from my bilingual speech therapist.*
- *I worked in a classroom where translators are readily available.*
- *I always use a back up interpreter just in case. I speak slowly and use precise pronunciation of words.*
- *Consultation with speech therapist who is bilingual and using one step instructions, and concrete symbols.*
- *Use of same interpreter over time, one who relates well with parents, and who understands the IEP process.*
- *Working with ESL people and bilingual paraprofessionals.*
- *Using good translators.*
- *Knowing where and how to contact a bilingual interpreter and the minimal ability to speak and understand the student's native language.*

Category	**Responses**
Support requested or received by educators.	**26**

To include: inservice training support; learning about culture of non-English speaking students; and supportive school district.

The following responses illustrate this category:

- *Meeting and training with social workers who come from the same cultural background.*
- *Knowing some of the cultural expectations and differences are helpful in presenting ideas and suggestions in a non offensive manner to the family.*
- *My school district is very cooperative.*
- *Many inservices provided were a great help.*
- *Inservices with our ESL professionals.*
- *A paraprofessional helped me learn a few words in Spanish.*
- *Understanding cultural differences.*
- *A basic understanding of the language and culture.*

Category	**Responses**
Teacher education	**25**

To include: good educational background by teachers; and background in a second language.

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

- *Having knowledge of others languages is helpful.*
- *Understanding language development. I have 21+ hours of speech pathology and language acquisition is a large part of that.*
- *Having a child development and early education background has been the most helpful to me.*
- *It helped to learn about the stages of second language acquisition. There usually is a relatively long "silent" period. (Yeah, my student was not in depression or shutting down!)*
- *Articles in JVIB related to cultural practices and differences. Talking with Hispanic and Native American teachers and paraprofessionals.*

- *Understanding about "Sheltered English." Knowing the language background is important even in children who do not speak.*
- *Knowledge of language and culture have been the most helpful with LEP students and their families. In general, I have followed the instructional strategies of the ESL or bilingual teacher in working with students in the classroom.*

Category	**Responses**
Attitudinal factors	**7**

To include: open-mindedness; good sense of humor; knowing when to ask for help; and making students and families comfortable.

Responses illustrating this category include:

- *Sensitivity, compassion, and sense of humor.*
- *Knowing when I need help.*
- *Sense of humor and a good dictionary.*
- *Showing students that you too are making an effort to communicate.*

Category	**Responses**
Miscellaneous	**7**

Some of the responses that illustrate this category include:

- *Use the same approach for my Spanish kids as I would for my English kids.*
- *I treat them the same as everyone else.*
- *Helping student obtain a working functional vocabulary in daily needs and for earning money.*
- *Encouragement to continue speaking and learning English as much as possible.*

In addition to the responses explained above we were unable to classify five responses because they were either unclear or we were not able to place them into a category. In addition, six respondents indicated not having had the opportunities to learn how to work with the LEP population.

Question #3

What are some issues that concern you about the testing practices currently taking place in your school to test LEP students with visual impairments?

Category	Responses
No response	**219**

To include: I don't know; I am unaware of the issues; and lack of familiarity with issues.

Category	Responses
Concerns about the qualifications of evaluators	**58**

To include: lack of bilingual evaluators; lack of training by evaluators in visual impairments; and too much reliance on teacher for the visually impaired for the evaluation.

Responses that illustrate this category include:

- *Testing is done by a paraprofessional supposedly under supervision of a certified person, but the certified person usually isn't truly a bilingual speaker.*
- *We do not have a translators traveling with our assessors.*
- *The people testing are not trained to test LEP child who is VI.*
- *No teachers for the visually impaired able to speak Spanish well enough to conduct vision functioning evaluation.*
- *Not enough professional testers for the blind who know a foreign language.*
- *There are not enough bilingual professionals in the field and the students are suffering because they are not always assessed by bilingual teachers.*
- *Many ESL teachers feel they cannot evaluate or teach a child who cannot respond to pictures!*
- *Students are tested in their native language by personnel from the bilingual special education testing department, vision evaluations are done by vision teachers assisted by a translator. However, the evaluators do not come to staffings to explain their findings.*

•Schools think that the teacher for visually impaired students should be able to solve all the educational related needs.

Category	**Responses**
Sharing testing practices in their program	**45**

To include: current tests and practices and personal thoughts about testing issues.

Responses illustrating this category include:

•We use our district's test that has been modified for VH students. We use objects for questions that use pictures, and use large print and braille.

•In the past we have tested students orally and eliminated parts of test, and even enlarged materials. This year, I was told my students would not be tested until they "figure something out...."

•We have a bilingual diagnostician who tests the Spanish students. I don't know what they do for other ESL students (Russian, Vietnamese, etc.)

•If the student is very limited in English and very visually impaired, we'll talk and collaborate, or test together at times. For the past 15 years I've had 30-60% LEP students, this is more the rule than the exception in most schools.

•Although the district is concerned that comprehensive assessment cannot be conducted without a translator, they are not making any efforts for related testing and instruction.

•I feel there is a need for the use of professional translators and interpreters in this area. Many examiners may speak some Spanish, but whether or not it is at a sufficient level is questionable.

•If the child is not tested in their strongest language, I feel it is not a true test of their ability.

Category	**Responses**
Concerns about tests and testing procedures	**34**

To include: appropriateness of test for braille users; appropriateness of tests for bilingual students; quality of testing process; and lack of follow through with evaluations.

The following responses illustrate this category:

- *I don't think the VH students are tested as thoroughly as other LEP students because of lack of testing materials in braille and large print.*
- *Inappropriate assessments that are culturally biased. Assessors with little experience and appropriate assessments for students who are visually impaired.*
- *I fear some students are labeled with much lower scores because their vision and language needs.*
- *Since we only have two Spanish speaking psychologists, it takes time to coordinate a meeting for testing.*
- *I have particular concerns with our potentially gifted totally blind students. Often, because of cultural deprivation they do not test gifted.*
- *Many of the tests do not come in braille, especially Spanish or Creole braille. They ask us to braille tests without much notice and since most of us don't have a lot of knowledge of the language and rules, this is a major problem.*
- *The use of an untrained individual for translating, we use a secretary who is bilingual.*
- *Non-verbal multiply-handicapped students frequently are not assessed and their receptive language needs are not addressed. Braille testing materials in languages other than English are not easily available.*

Question #4

What are some issues that concern you about the instruction provided to LEP students with visual impairments in your school?

Category	**Responses**
No response	**181**

This category also included respondents who stated "I don't know" as a response.

Category	**Responses**
Language Issues	**49**

To include: Teachers not speaking other languages; use of paraprofessionals who speak the language of the students; translation for parents or students; limited English proficiency not given consideration; and not teaching English fast enough.

Responses illustrating this category include:

- *When the instruction is provided by me, I worry that the student's time is not being well spent. Particularly with the two young LEP students. I feel that there should be a bilingual teacher teaching the specialized skills that they need to help them cope with the visual impairment.*
- *The impact of having all the instruction in a language that isn't your native language is downplayed in the child's life, especially if they are developmentally delayed.*
- *Non-professional translators are frequently employed for critical meetings. Untrained translators make frequent error, tend to summarize or paraphrase incorrectly, and sometimes assume a non-neutral stance.*
- *By the time consideration is given to other disabilities, their limited English language is not given the consideration that it should.*
- *A greater availability of teachers trained in LEP issues is needed to speed and ease the transition form native language to English.*
- *I really believe that when people from other countries come here it is their responsibility to learn English. I think people think it's OK to be living here for 2 or 3 years and not attempt to learn the language. It's America, speak English if you want to live here. I do agree with schools trying to help students and families learn the language. I think the only braille book should be the Spanish/English dictionary.*

Category	**Responses**
Training, Testing, Placement and Program Issues	**31**

This categories included: training for staff; quality of testing; and responsibilities of teachers for students with visual impairments who work with ESL students;

Some of the responses illustrating this category include:

- *Teachers in general education don't really want to concern themselves with blind Hispanic children. If students could see, then they would be more concerned. They feel these kids are just too much for them to handle and just don't want to do anything extra for them. They say they aren't trained and they don't feel it's their job.*
- *The quality and consistency of instruction. The impression that I have is that no one professional feels "responsible" for LEP/VI students.*
- *Lack of accountability of ESL as part of the IEP process.*
- *Minimal support is provided for high school level courses. My student has been failing courses and was made to retake them in spite of my attempt to intervene regarding the level of vocabulary required in these courses.*
- *The typical ESL student attending ESL classes for 1-3 years is lacking in one of the other content areas. If a student misses two years of science to acquire English the expectation to pass this subject with high marks is unreasonable. The assimilation process involves all teachers and parents to work together to provide the student with the necessary support to succeed.*
- *I don't believe it is our responsibility to teach ESL. I don't believe we should be responsible for writing the bilingual goals on the IEP. I believe ESL instruction should be taught by a credential teacher either in a bilingual classroom or a pull-out basis. There is a definite lack of communication between the visually impaired special education administrators and the language centers, leading to much confusion at the school site levels. I would like to see federal and state guidelines on who is responsible for providing ESL to VI/LEP.*

Category	**Responses**
Adaptation of Materials	**27**

The following responses illustrate this category:

- *Materials don't seem to be readily available in other languages.*
- *We teach children to read English. We do not have Spanish braille for reading instruction. Everyone is in Patterns. I am curious about children learning to read in their primary language in braille as they do in full bilingual programs in regular schools. I have worked with Kindergarten LEP students for several years who have been able to distinguish braille letters, but haven't been ready to read English because of lack of oral English. I would like to hear about studies that have been done about this.*
- *Our population of students are severely handicapped. Simplified materials are not readily available. I make whatever is needed to be made to supplement and support all instruction provided to LEP students with visual impairments. Kits of materials are made and pulled together to supplement students visual concerns in class.*

Category	**Responses**
Miscellaneous responses	**27**

Some of these responses included:

- *Not enough resources.*
- *They need additional assistance in exploration and understanding due to language barriers. Often, not enough money or time is available and follow-through at home is usually very limited.*
- *The lack of public information and lack of empowerment of minorities regarding their children's education. They do not know how to deal or fight the system in order to get better quality education for their children.*

Category	**Responses**
Unrelated information	**23**

Responses that were not directly contributing a concern but were somewhat related to the population of students were included under this category.

Some of these responses included:

- *I don't feel that the instructors, the State and/or the Federal government should be responsible to put time and money into a multi-cultural society. If we require educators to become proficient in another language, will it not discriminate against those in more diverse groups?*
- *Students gravitate to the gangs and show no respect for the Americans for the educational opportunities we afford.*
- *I don't think the students, whether VI or not, need to spend all day in a class where only Spanish, for example, is spoken. In order to learn something the child needs to be given the opportunity to use it.*

In addition to the themes stated above, twenty-three respondents expressed that they had "no problems" or "had no additional concerns."

Conclusion

This study was conducted with the goal of identifying some of the challenges educators of students with visual impairment face when working with linguistically diverse students. In doing so, we hope that teacher preparation programs will use this information when designing and implementing curriculum changes into their programs to address the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students with visual impairments.

We have learned that 27.3% of the students who were receiving services from the teachers who participated in the study came from homes were a language other than English was spoken, and that at least 8.2% of the students were still classified as having limited proficiency in English. We also learned that 80.2% of the teachers were working with students who came from second language homes, and that 43.8% of the teachers had students who were classified as having limited proficiency in English. Yet, only 45.7% of the teachers had any type of training related to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

When rating their knowledge and the importance of competencies related to linguistically diverse learners, educators were consistent in rating their knowledge lower than their perceived importance of the competencies. When responding to questions related to instructional and assessment practices with students with limited proficiency in English, we learned that many teachers were not aware of the current program practices. This fact points to the need to include such issues in teacher preparation programs and to increase the collaboration among bilingual, ESL, and teachers for students with visual impairments at the local school level.

In the responses to open-ended questions educators shared many of the concerns they have related to working with this population. Their concerns included working with families, lack of bilingual support for assessment and instruction, making decisions about the language of instruction, and availability of braille materials in other languages.

Educating children with visual and multiple impairments has become a great challenge due to the lack of qualified teachers that exist in many states and the resources needed to adequately meet students' educational needs. Moreover, the demographic changes that many school districts have experienced present teacher preparation programs with the additional responsibility to evaluate the preparation offered to future teachers so that they are able to meet the educational needs of all students with visual impairments--including those who come from diverse culture and language groups.

References

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1994). *Teacher education pipeline III: Schools, colleges, and Department of Education enrollment by race, ethnicity, and gender*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baca, L., Fradd, S. H., & Collier, C. (1990). Progress in preparing personnel to meet the needs of handicapped limited English proficient students: Results of a survey in three highly impacted states. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 7, 5-20.

Burstein, N., Cabello, B., & Hamann, J. (1993). Teacher preparation for culturally diverse urban students: Infusing competencies across the curriculum. *Teacher Education in Special Education, 16*(1), 1-13.

Fradd, S. H., Algozzine, B., & Salend, S. J. (1988). A survey of training needs in bilingual special education. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 2, 5-16.

Hadaway, N., & Florez, V. (1988). Diversity in the classroom: Are our teachers prepared? *Teacher Education and Practice, 4*(1), 25-30.

Hernandez von Hoff, G. A. (1992). Principals' perceptions of their preparation for administering educational programs for limited English proficient (LEP) students. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 11*, 85-104.

Ortiz, A. A., Yates, J. R., & Garcia, S. B. (1990). Competencies associated with serving exceptional language minority students. *The Bilingual Special Education Perspective*, 9, 1-5.

Part IV: Annotated Bibliography

One of the assignments required of students enrolled in EDSE 508: Teaching Second Language Learners with Visual Impairments, was to research the literature in English as a second language, multicultural education, bilingual education, language learning, and bilingual special education and write summaries of their readings. Because of space reasons we have edited students' work to provide this annotated bibliography. We would like to thank the following students who contributed their readings during the time of the project:

Trina Boyd
Susan M. Buck
Joanie M. Carlisle
Gwen Carroll
Jennifer Furness
Ralph Gedeon
April Haseman
Scotia Hayes
Bob Hoffman
Jaiah C. Kallon
Loana Mason
Shelly Moats
Janis Mountford
Linda A. Neratko
Wayne Oshiro
Julia Kay Pitcher
Danielle Placek
Scott Probart
Gregory N. Wellems
Julee D. Wetzstein
Doris M. Willoughby
Kristin Zumpfe

We would also like to recognize and thank Carmel Yarger for the assistance she provided in editing the summaries of articles and chapters.

Adams, K., Belkin, L., Chavez, R., & Hornback, J. (1991). Dropping out of school: Issues affecting culturally, ethnically, and linguistically distinct student groups. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 8, 1-15.

Enrollment of culturally, ethnically, and linguistically distinct students continues to increase and yet our schools are not culturally and contextually sensitive to the diverse needs of students. Students dropping out of secondary schools in rank order are Native Americans, Hispanics, African Americans, some Asian groups, and poor European Americans. Reasons given for these dropout rates are: (a) educator's low expectations, (b) too few minority teachers, (c) over-reliance on testing, (d) poverty and hopelessness, (e) abuse of the educational legacy among low-income parents, and (f) negative peer pressure. The following recommendations are provided by the authors to help decrease the dropout rate among minority students:

- Change the length of the school year, school day, and classroom function.
- Spend more time on subjects of interest to minority students.
- Reduce class sizes.
- Develop a flexible curriculum.
- Encourage higher expectations from teachers and counselors.
- Provide peer and adult tutoring.
- Make financial aid available to alleviate after school jobs and provide more time for studying.
- Educate parents, teachers and students about issues impacting minority students.

Baca, L., & Cervantes, H. T. (1989). Background and rationale for bilingual special education. In L. M. Baca & H.T. Cervantes (Eds.), The bilingual special education interface (pp.1-21). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

The authors stated that all children have a right to access an education through a language they understand with teachers trained to meet their unique individual needs. Unfortunately, language minority students are sometimes placed in inappropriate educational settings.

This chapter made suggestions for bilingual special education programs. First, students who are assessed should be given tests in their native language by a professional who speaks that language. Next, goals and objectives written for the student must include aspects of the student's bilingual and cultural needs. Finally, students who are non-native speakers of English with special needs must be appropriately diagnosed and placed in order to reach their educational potential.

Baca, L., & Payan, R. (1989). Development of bilingual special education interface. In L. M. Baca & H. T. Cervantes (Eds.), The bilingual special education interface (pp. 79-99). Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Co.

It is important to build on students' native language when assisting them in developing their second language. Children who fully develop use of their native language build a strong basis for learning a second language. The authors developed the following suggestions to help teachers, students, and parents involved in the general or special education of bilingual students.

Teachers of language minority students should:

- Have native or near native proficiency in the student's native language.
- Be sensitive to and accepting of the minority language.
- Be knowledgeable about primary language development processes.
- Be knowledgeable about second language acquisition.
- Seek language, methodology, and cultural training to develop the skills necessary for implementing instructional programs.

Language minority students should:

- Receive instruction in and through their primary language on a consistent basis, from kindergarten to grade six.
- Receive formal reading instruction in the primary language.
- Access a variety of reading materials in their primary language at all grade levels and subject areas.

- Develop the second language (English) within a comprehensible, meaningful context.
- Receive second language instruction focusing on meaningful content.
- Be allowed to respond in either language.

Parents of language minority students should:

- Be given sufficient information regarding instructional programs.
- Be encouraged to use the primary language in the home, especially in literary activities.
- Be encouraged to participate in school activities and projects.

Barrera, I. (1993). Effective and appropriate instruction for all children: The challenge of cultural/linguistic diversity and young children with special needs. Topics in Early Childhood Special Education, 13, 461-487.

When a child's home has one culture and language, and the school has a different culture and language, the child experiences "discontinuity between environments." This is true even when children are not developmentally ready to speak. They already respond to the pattern and intonation of the native language, and to familiar child-rearing practices. When too little attention is given to the process of acculturation, the resulting stress can mimic a learning disability.

Barrera listed six variables as vital in understanding a particular child's unique situation: (a) level of acculturation, (b) characteristics of home and community environment, (c) preferred learning behaviors, (d) family's socioeconomic and living resources, (e) language history and usage, and (f) linguistic development.

The following four approaches represent a continuum, from greatest to least availability of the child's native language during the process:

- Full bilingual approach uses both English and the first language in whatever proportion is deemed most appropriate for the child's needs. Notably, the child's strongest language is used for primary instruction while skills in English are being acquired.
- Dominant language bilingual approach uses English the majority of the time, but provides the non-English language as part of the instruction whenever it is most needed.

- Modified single language approach uses English most of the time, but occasionally uses the other language for clarification or reinforcement.
- Multicultural monolingual approach is appropriate for children who are diverse culturally but for whom English is a first language.

Connors, J. L., & Donnellan, A. M. (1993). Citizenship and culture: The role of disabled people in Navajo society. Disability, Handicap, and Society, 8, 265-280.

The Navajo Nation, encompassing parts of Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona, has maintained its cultural uniqueness and political independence, due in part to the inaccessibility of its communities. Efforts in the past to centralize educational facilities and treatment centers outside of the reservation were misguided. In fact, children with disabilities were sometimes hidden to prevent then from being uprooted from the family. More recently, a treatment center for severely disabled Navajo children and youth was established on the reservation, thereby linking the families with service providers.

Members of the Navajo nation regard persons with disabilities with a clear understanding of individuals' capabilities. The more able the person, the higher the expectations. The person with less ability is granted more latitude. With these expectations, there are many tasks and responsibilities that can be done or adapted to include the person with a disability in the community and acknowledge citizenship in the Navajo Nation.

Mentioned in the article, and of use for the vision professional, are the value of and respect for silence and gaze avoidance. This is at odds with the usual western expectation for communication. Additionally, since the individual with a disability has full membership in Navajo society, it is imperative that the professional from outside the reservation honor and acknowledge the surrounding community and consider its incorporation into the Individualized Educational Program.

When advocating for independent living skills, mobility training, and vocational training, the vision professional needs to keep in mind the student's surroundings, and the mores of the community. By adopting the concept of citizenship, professionals will find ways to meet the needs of students without pulling them away from their world.

Correa, V. I. (1987). Working with Hispanic parents of visually impaired children: Cultural implications. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 81, 260-264.

Professionals working with Hispanic families need to be aware of cultural and language differences by demonstrating respect and sensitivity toward the family. Understanding general descriptions of Hispanic families is helpful when assessing and working within these family systems.

In general, some Hispanic parents struggle with issues of acceptance of the visual impairment and over-protection of the child who is visually impaired. Overlaying the disability is the family's efforts toward enculturation into mainstream America, including the language difference. Furthermore, the structure of Hispanic families tends to be highly traditional, with the husband as protector and provider for the family and the wife as the primary keeper of the home and children.

The following suggestions are intended to assist teachers of students who have visual impairments to work more effectively with Hispanic families:

- Be sensitive to Hispanic cultural issues and integrate these issues into goals and activities.
- Bridge language barriers by providing a translator when working with parents.
- Empower parents to carry out interventions with the child.
- Respect the family system and understand the importance of the extended family. Involve family members in the intervention process.
- Be aware that parents may insulate themselves from non-family members, and may not openly share their feelings and reactions with non-family members.
- Establish goals collaboratively with the family to ensure their compatibility with the cultural norms of the family.

Correa, V., & Tulberg, B. (1991). Teaching culturally diverse students. Preventing School Failure, 35 (3), 20-25.

The number of culturally diverse students attending American schools is on the rise. This increasing diversity creates a myriad of challenges for many school systems trying to provide a quality education for students who are not proficient in English. Among the population of culturally diverse students a large number have special education needs. This is the result of immigration from preliterate societies and lack of understanding of the performance and cultural expectations in the United States.

Culturally diverse students are at risk for school failure because of their lack of English proficiency, behavioral characteristics, and socioeconomic status. Often, lack of English language proficiency is misidentified as a language disorder. Seemingly atypical behaviors may be culturally appropriate in their native culture or a normal reaction to acculturation. A large percentage of minority students come from poor homes and have little preparation for school, leading to high school drop out.

The authors suggested the educational needs of culturally diverse students can be better met by: (a) coordinating the efforts of teaming professionals, (b) providing appropriate services, (c) involving family and community in the education process, (d) conducting appropriate assessments, and (e) increasing the quality of instruction by valuing students' cultural backgrounds and adapting to individual student differences.

Duran, R. (1989). Assessment and instruction of at risk Hispanic students. Exceptional Children, 56, 154-158.

Assessment of at-risk Hispanic individuals warrants careful consideration. There are two primary limitations in existing test practices: validity and reliability concerns, and instructional interventions. Validity and reliability are called into question due to students' cultural and linguistic differences from the population upon which the test was normed.

Instructional interventions often place Hispanic students into remedial groups that undermine the student's self esteem.

Curriculum based assessments evaluate students' abilities while eliciting instructional strategies based on individualized potential. This type of strategy, based on the tenets of Vygotsky's work, theorizes that assessment is an intricate part of the learning experience.

Another form of assessment is dynamic assessment. It combines the assessment of a student's readiness to learn with instruction in content and skill areas, following a train, test, train cycle. The goal of this intervention is to increase student's learning activities by giving the appropriate amounts of support and intervention. The teacher provides "effective hints and cues" so students can assimilate new information.

Using a dynamic assessment approach combines the assessment of the student with determination of the most appropriate instructional tools. The assessment arena leads teachers to find the best means of facilitating learning in students.

Echevarria, J. (1995). Sheltered instruction for students with learning disabilities who have limited English proficiency. Intervention in School and Clinic, 30, 302-305.

Ideally, the most effective method of teaching linguistically diverse students is to use their native language. However, since there is a lack of bilingual special education teachers, other options need to be considered. One of these options is Sheltered Instruction. Sheltered Instruction includes using a slower rate of speech, controlled vocabulary, and extensive hands-on activities combined with a content driven approach to instruction. Extensive individual instruction is provided combined with student interactions designed with native and non-native speakers of English in mind.

The Sheltered Instruction format includes the following steps:

- Target Vocabulary: Choose vocabulary that dovetails with real life objects and models.
- Select a Main Concept: Target one main concept from each lesson, using the key vocabulary to reinforce this concept.

- Create a Context: Reinforce the concepts being taught by providing meaningful experiences using as many of the senses as possible to create an image.
- Make Connections: Use students' personal experiences and relate them to the concept to increase the meaningfulness of the lesson.
- Check for Understanding: Monitor students' understanding of the material being taught.
- Encourage Student-to-Student Interactions: Encourage collaborative activities making certain that each student (with or without a disability) is actively engaging in the group process.

Echevarria, J., & McDonough, R. (1995). An alternative reading approach: Instructional conversations in a bilingual special education setting. Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 10, 108-119.

Instructional conversation (IC) is an instructional approach that shows students how to become actively involved with printed text. The goal of this approach is to help students develop reading comprehension, text analysis, and critical thinking skills. Using IC methods may promote better comprehension of text than tradition basal activities, especially for students who are not native users of English.

One of the primary benefits of IC was that it afforded students an opportunity to express their opinions and feelings about the text, through interactive discussions with other students. This holistic approach to reading enabled students to bring their background experiences and knowledge to the themes present in the text.

Esquivel, G. B., & Yoshida, R. (1985). Special education for language minority students. Focus on Exceptional Children, 18, 1-8.

There are many instructional methods and approaches for promoting academic achievement in language with language minority students. These methods include:

- increasing learning time
- selecting the appropriate language

- providing meaningful experiential context
- understanding the role of motivation and lack of ability
- being familiar with reading approaches and methods
- understanding the teacher-student relationship

Bilingual children often initially demonstrate lower levels of achievement compared to their monolingual peers due to the constraints of second language learning. The language of instruction, therefore, is dependent on the severity of the language difficulty. Some children benefit more from bilingual instruction, while other progress faster with instruction given in the native language.

Actively encourage students to use language while engaged in meaningful activities rich in context, rather than presenting it through the more traditional lecture style. When teaching conceptual skills through interactions with students, they have the opportunity to discuss and question lesson materials using both their native language and English. It is especially helpful to relate the new information to students' background knowledge and experiences.

The teacher-student relationship is another important aspect of the language minority student's school experience. When a language minority student is behaving poorly, teachers need to examine the instructional strategies being implemented as well as looking at the student's motivation for such behavior. Finally, teachers need to be aware that language minority students face a great deal of stress in their lives.

Figueroa, R. A. (1989). Psychological testing of linguistic minority students: Knowledge gaps and regulations. Exceptional Children, 56, 145-152.

There exist potential negative repercussions associated with the use of psychometric assessments with language minority students. These students are often tested, in English, soon after enrollment in school whereas, it takes five years or more to achieve academic proficiency in English. Even when only relying on performance, rather than verbal scores, the results belie the true intelligence of language minority students.

Direct use of interpreters as an integral part of the assessment process may be inappropriate practice. Often, underqualified individuals are used, thereby biasing test administration. Additionally, although the words of the English test are translated into a different language, translation of concepts and ideas presented in the test are more difficult to convey.

Fradd, S., & Correa, V. I. (1989). Hispanic students at risk: Do we abdicate or advocate? Exceptional Children, 56, 105-110.

Hispanic is defined as persons from Spain or Spanish-speaking Latin America and refers to all races with cultural ties to the use of the Spanish language and Latino culture. Hispanic people make up the largest growing segment of the of the population in the United States. The future of education for Hispanic students is dependent upon issues of assessment and second language acquisition, along with early intervention practices, effective transdisciplinary teaming, a high level of family involvement, and sensitivity to linguistic and cultural differences. Special education professionals need to be sensitive to the needs of Hispanic individuals and provide assessment and instruction, giving consideration to their linguistic and cultural needs.

Fradd, S. H. (1991). Effective practices in meeting the needs students with non-English language backgrounds. Preventing School Failure, 36, 35-40.

The use of terminology to label students reflects the user's perception of the student with English language learning needs. For example, the term non-English-language-background is applied to students whose language and culture are different from the mainstream. Limited English proficient refers to students who do not have the necessary English language skills to function in the general education classroom without assistance.

Teachers have not been trained to meet the needs of the growing population of culturally and linguistically diverse students. The author suggests that to assist students with limited English skills, school districts should provide teachers with information regarding students' backgrounds.

This information can link the home and school environments, to help obtain ideas for cultural activities, games, and materials that can be used to integrate these students with English speaking students. In this way, students who are reluctant to communicate are encouraged to participate even if it is nonverbally.

Materials and cultural artifacts about students' native culture and language provide an avenue for them to relate their world to a new setting. Selecting instructional materials based on student's past experiences, along with peer tutoring and parental involvement encourage and promote communication and language usage.

Gersten, R., & Woodward, J. (1994). The language-minority student and special education: Issues, trends, and paradoxes. Exceptional Children, 60, 310-312.

Growing numbers of people are immigrating to the United States, yet traditional school programs are not equipped to meet the needs of these students. There is a severe shortage of trained personnel in special and general education, prepared to work with language minority students.

One of the problems facing teachers of language minority students is the challenge of determining whether a student has learning problems, or is experiencing academic difficulties due to the acquisition of English as a second language. Another concern is the tendency for over-representation of language minority groups in special education classrooms.

Many different models for bilingual instruction are available, however, there is some debate over which model is most effective for use with language minority students. These models tend to fall into natural language or skills-based approaches. What is indicated, is a merging of the skills often taught in special education classrooms with process-oriented approaches currently taking place in many classrooms today.

Students from language-minority groups benefit from some second language instruction grounded in process-oriented approaches, not however, to the total exclusion of strategy and skill instruction. What is clearly needed is a joining of the fields of special education and bilingual education to collaborate toward developing effective instructional methods with students from language minority backgrounds.

Goodman, S. A., & Rueda, R. (1988). Developing writing skills in bilingual exceptional children. Exceptional Children, 54, 543-551.

Traditionally, bilingual students learn to read and write in the target language after some level of oral proficiency has been obtained. However, the integration of writing skills at the same time has been found to be helpful for supporting oral language development.

Writing skills are developed through a systematic progression of skills, resulting in several implications for exceptional children. The most important is that developmental delays do not preclude introduction of meaningful writing experiences in the classroom. These students do progress in their writing efforts if they are supported in their early attempts to do so.

Writing is characterized as a problem solving task with three components: planning, translating, and reviewing. If students are capable but do not always employ the process, it may be because they do not have sufficient cognitive resources. For the bilingual exceptional student, the threshold may be even lower.

In the functional interactive approach, emphasis is placed on the social aspect of learning, thereby increasing the teacher's role in the activity. The teacher facilitates the child's learning through assisting the child to an independent level of work. This emphasizes children's active involvement in their own learning and integrates language and culture into the writing process.

Exceptional second language students can write and need to be encouraged to express themselves. The emphasis should not be on mechanics, but rather on what the student wants to say.

Harrington-Austin, E., & DiBona, J. (1993). Bringing multiculturalism to the historically black university in the United States. Educational Horizons, 150-156.

Some Black students received a poor reception during their school years. They therefore looked for a fully Black experience at institutions of higher education, thus making the idea of accepting multiculturalism very challenging. The idea of historically Black colleges being affected and influenced by Whites was not well accepted. The authors gave examples of all-Black universities disapproving of ethnic diversity and race. One student responded in this article by stating, "I attended North Carolina Central to find out more about my culture, and if you increase the population of non-Blacks, then our culture is invaded by the White man" (p.154).

The authors emphasized that it was important to remember that specific problems do arise when initially implementing cultural diversity programs. It is also important to note that all Black student populations want to see their Black enrollment increase, not be invaded by non-Black students. The emphasis must therefore be placed on leading the way through literature and education for diverse groups to acquire more knowledge about themselves and others.

Harris, K. (1991). An expanded view on consultation competencies for educators serving culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional students. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14, 25-29.

There currently exist three types of teacher preparation programs in bilingual special education: Traditional special education programs that bring in bilingual minority students, traditional special education programs with bilingual special education components mixed into existing classwork, and bilingual special education coursework with specific bilingual coursework. There are, however, many types of bilingual special education service delivery models. These range from full time self-contained special education classrooms to full time integration into the general education settings.

Collaborative consultation is an effective way to facilitate the coordination of programs for exceptional students. Successful collaboration is based upon professional respect and recognition of other's expertise, and is dependent on every member's involvement and ability to communicate effectively. Consultation competencies include:

- understanding one's own perspective
- using effective interpersonal communication and problem solving skills
- understanding the roles of the educational consultant

- using appropriate assessment and instructional strategies

Harry, B. (1992). Restructuring the participation of African-American parents in special education. Exceptional Children, 59, 123-131.

This article stressed the need for a more equitable balance of power between special education professionals and African-American parents. There tend to be a number of misconceptions between these two groups which limits their effectiveness in working together.

Some African-American parents are perceived by educators as being uninterested in their children's education due to limited participation by parents in school activities. This lower level of participation often is related to logistical constraints, as well as stressful life circumstances.

To increase collaboration between specialists and parents, parents must be included, as partners, in the educational process. Professionals need to be cautious about placing too much emphasis on formalized, academic learning to the exclusion of natural learning that takes place within the family. The following recommendations are helpful in increasing the balance of power between parents and special educators:

- Parents as Assessors: Enables parents to be part of the assessment process by providing them with an opportunity to interpret and explain the meaning of their child's nonverbal, linguistic, and social behaviors, which may be foreign to others.
- Parents as Presenters of Information: Empowers parents to share their ideas, which are entered into the record, then used in the decision making process.
- Parents as Policy Makers: Encourages the formation of active parent groups in which a representative is selected to represent each group in dealings with faculty.
- Parents as Advocates: Forms parent advocacy groups to empower other parents and to share what they have learned.

Harry, B. (1992). Making sense of disability: Low-income, Puerto Rican parents' theories of the problem. Exceptional Children, 59, 27-40.

Twelve Puerto-Rican families, residing in a low-income, largely Hispanic community in the United States, having a total of 17 children identified with a learning disability or mild mental retardation, participated in a study that investigated their perceptions about their child's special education placement. These parents had little formal education and were in the early stages of acculturation into the United States.

The study took place over a period of nine months. Data was collected through unstructured interviews with feedback between the researcher and the participant to be certain of accuracy and correct interpretation. The interviews were conducted in Spanish or a combination of Spanish and English.

Results of this study indicated these parents had a much wider interpretation of "normal" than did educators. Some terms such as "handicapped" and "retarded" were confusing and seen as more extreme forms of deviance.

Other findings from this study were that parents often had their own theories for explaining their child's difficulties. Also, there was a strong family identity as a group, rather than as a collection of individuals. The "problem" was seen as existing within the group or family, rather than within an individual. Some though, chose to avoid the label "retarded" because of the stigma attached to it. Parents in this study sometimes disagreed with the label assigned to their child, but agreed with professionals about the child's performance. For example, parents may reject the term "retarded," but will agree that their child is slower in developing.

Harry, B., Allen, N., & McLaughlin, M. (1995). Communication versus compliance: African-American parent's involvement in special education. Exceptional Children, 61, 354-375.

This article described a three year longitudinal study focusing on African-American parental involvement in special education. The study took place in a large urban school district where the majority of students and professional staff were African-American. Data was collected through interviews, observations of parent conferences, and review of documents, then coded and analyzed.

An interesting outcome in this study was parents' spiraling disillusionment with special education programming. Initially, parents believed the purpose of preschool was to enable their child to "catch up". Yet, over the course of the three years, they became disillusioned with the physical and academic isolation of self contained classrooms, inappropriate peer groups, and labeling. Decreased parental involvement and participation along with unsuccessful attempts at advocacy were also identified. Deterrents to involvement included: (a) late notices and inflexible scheduling of meetings, (b) emphasis on documents rather than participation, (c) use of educational jargon, and (d) an unequal power structure, intimidating and undermining parents' efforts.

The authors suggested that professionals need to focus more on enhancing communication with families rather than on issues of compliance. Additionally, the following suggestions were noted:

- The need to treat family members as equal partners in the decision making process;
- Procedures for assessment and placement need to be clearly communicated and understood by family members.
- Failure to identify a special need early in the process may lead to confusion and reluctance on the part of family members at a later time.

Empowering parents leads to effective and ongoing parental involvement.

Hoover, J., & Collier, C. (1991). Meeting the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional learners. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14, 30-34.

In order to appropriately meet the needs of language minority students, pre-referral interventions and additional training for teachers are needed. Prior to a placement meeting for special education services, intervention strategies, provided to the classroom teacher by a team of peers, should be employed. These interventions help determine the causes of behavior or learning problems in language minority students with sensitivity toward cultural and language differences, and disability. Accurate documentation of the student's performance and response to the pre-referral interventions aid in preliminary diagnostic judgments made about the student's need for further intervention or formal evaluation.

English as a Second Language programs are the most common placement for students who are non-Hispanic and limited English proficient. In these programs, students receive tutoring assistance with general education coursework. However, most educators are not prepared to work with language minority students. All educators need to become sensitive to the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students, and how disability is perceived in the cultures represented by the individual students.

One way to assist teachers in general education classroom settings to meet the needs of minority special education students is through increased preparation and training at the preservice and inservice levels, including the needs of minority students with special needs. Training should include: (a) nondiscriminatory assessment practices, (b) cross-cultural sensitization of special education, (c) language disorder and difference diagnosis, (d) cross-cultural counseling, (e) parental involvement, (f) curriculum adaptation, and (g) school and community services helpful to minority students who have learning or behavior problems.

Hudson, P., & Fradd, S. (1990). Cooperative planning for learners with limited English proficiency. Teaching Exceptional Children, 23, 16-21.

This article outlined a cooperative planning strategy for use with students with limited English proficiency (LEP). Instruction for LEP students was most beneficial when there was collaboration among general education teachers, ESL teachers, administrators, and counselors. Cooperative planning requires that educational plan development and maintenance be the responsibility of all team members. The following information describes cooperative planning strategies:

Step 1. Target the students. Selection is based on teacher and student schedules, student strengths and needs, teacher commitment to collaboration, and probability of student success.
Step 2. Specify and summarize student data. All instructional team members compile information regarding students based on observations and includes learning styles, use of language, academic strengths, social skills, and student background.
Step 3. Establish a meeting time and state the purpose. Follow a pre-established agenda focusing on collaborative efforts to facilitate student success.
Step 4. Establish and maintain rapport. Meetings begin with a short discussion on a neutral topic which serves to foster cooperation among all team members. Subsequent contributions to discussion receive equal attention and are given value.
Step 5. Share student information. Each instructional team member, in turn, shares the student information previously compiled.
Step 6. Elicit expectations of the demands of the setting. Using a cooperative planning worksheet, team members note the expectations of the general classroom.
Step 7. Determine discrepancies between student skills and class requirements.
Step 8. Plan the instructional intervention and monitoring system. Prioritize agreed upon interventions and develop a plan including responsibilities, goals and objectives.
Step 9. Implement the plan and follow up.

Hughes, M. (1994, April). Reading and the learning disabled child: Limited English proficient parents can help. Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children Annual Convention. Denver, CO.

A high level of parental involvement results in higher student achievement levels, increased attendance, lowered dropout rates, reduced delinquency rates, and improved attitudes toward school. Schools encourage parental involvement by being sensitive to the needs of parents with regard to their scheduling constraints, encouraging visits at any time, providing a qualified interpreter, and providing child care during conferences.

Important factors affecting parental involvement is the length of time the parents have lived in the United States coupled with their comfort level in the use of English. Additionally, their educational level and own experiences with school are also significant.

The following suggestions are intended to increase parent participation in school related meetings and activities:

- Write all signs and school communication in the home language of the family.
- Send home notes written in their native language with suggestions for helping their children with school work.
- Provide written and visual communication from the school.
- Recognize parents as they become more actively involved in the school.
- Call parents and send home notes sharing good news.
- Videotape some of the classes the child is involved in and send it home with the child.

These activities help parents to keep abreast of what is happening with their child at school and helps them feel part of the educational process.

Huyn, J., & Fowler, S. (1995). Respect, cultural sensitivity, and communication: Promoting participation by Asian families in the Individualized Family Service Plan. Teaching Exceptional Children, 28, 25-28.

When professionals increase their cultural awareness and sensitivity, their effectiveness is also increased when working with families from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds in early intervention programs. The authors specifically addressed cultural considerations with Asian families, but pointed out that it is important to view each family and situation as unique, as circumstances such as socioeconomic status, educational levels, and length of time in the United States impact cultural beliefs and values.

When working with a family where language is a barrier, use an interpreter who has a good understanding of cross-cultural considerations.

Suggestions for facilitating parent conferences include: (a) scheduling adequate times for meetings, (b) arranging meetings at convenient times for the family, (c) encouraging the family to bring relatives, cultural leaders, or friends, (d) providing an interpreter in native language, (e) avoiding overwhelming families with too many professionals, and (f) providing a comfortable and private meeting space.

When developing learner outcomes keep in mind the following:

- keep language concise and free from jargon
- determine who is the primary care-giver
- consider the family's beliefs about disability
- surmise who is the family decision maker
- elicit parents' expectations for both their child and the professional.

Finally, keep in mind that in Asian culture, teachers are highly respected, thus the parents may depend highly upon the teacher, rather than actively engage in a partnership. Outcomes need to be realistic and acceptable to the family.

Jordan, W. J., & McPartland, J. (1996). Exploring the causes of early dropout among race, ethnic and gender groups. Youth and Society, 28, 62-94.

Students who drop out of high school prior to earning their diploma are often impacted by negative school experiences, leading to the perception of school as an unwelcome place. Factors outside of the school leading to dropout include work, caring for a family member, or pregnancy. High school dropout perpetuates the cycle of poverty in families and communities.

Cultural and linguistic traditions of Hispanic and African American families are often contrary to school social norms and may be misinterpreted as disruptive and disrespectful. Students who do not have a strong grasp of English are likely to be labeled as having learning problems. Clearly, there is a need for teachers to become sensitive to cultural differences among minority students in schools.

Levinson, A. (1994, October 2). Blacks, Whites use coded words to separate themselves. The Denver Post, p. 26A.

Levinson, A. (1994, October 2). Whose language is it, anyway? The Denver Post, p. 21A, 26A.

The United States is becoming increasingly more diverse in customs, values, and languages. Color and class differences have become audible as well as visible.

In recent times, large numbers of African-Americans in urban neighborhoods have had little contact with Whites and developed very distinct language patterns. There is a distinctive African-American speech tradition called "Black English" with elements of being an entirely separate language from English. From the perspective of a Black person, it has the positive effect of promoting solidarity with others of one's race. However, it also has the negative aspect of creating divisions within the Black community, according to location and contact with the larger culture.

Most Blacks today are "bilingual" in the sense described previously. Those individuals on the economic margin regularly speak the two separate dialects: "Black English" when in the company of other Blacks, and the "language of the wider community" at other times. Other African-Americans, higher on the socioeconomic ladder, speak standard English most of the time; however, they too usually know most aspects of Black English and use it occasionally.

Lowrey, L. (1987). Rehabilitation relevant to culture and disability. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 81,162-164.

This article focused on the Navajo Nation and the uniqueness of their culture and lifestyle. The Navajo people hold individual perspectives on disabilities and the interventions needed. This is in contrast to government sponsored and run programs where expectations and goals reflect the needs of the broader society. Research on ways to effectively modify government programs toward increased cultural sensitivity is needed.

Lowrey reported that Navajo children with visual impairments are generally sent to state residential schools at a young age to access specialized training, due to a lack of specialized training in their community. While away, they may forget the Navajo language while being taught daily living and mobility skills needed for a middle-class urban society. However, the specific needs of their home community are not taken into account, and they therefore may find it difficult to return to their home community.

Mason, H. L. (1991). Use of the Blind Learning Aptitude Test with children in England, Wales, and the United States. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 85, 335-337.

The Blind Learning Aptitude Test (BLAT) has been standardized for use in the United States with children and youth ages 6-16. It is an American "touch" test for students who are blind. The test is divided into six groups, each measuring a different aspect of functioning. The BLAT was perceived to be a culturally fair test and measures the learning aptitude of a blind student by assessing the processes involved in learning. The student answers a question by pointing, thereby eliminating the need for a verbal explanation.

An 18 month study was conducted during which 14 schools for the visually impaired were visited to administer the BLAT to 110 blind, tactual learners, ages 5-16. The results showed that British students age 6-12 significantly out-performed their American peers, while scores for 12-16 years old were similar.

The BLAT is perceived to discriminate positively for disadvantaged groups of children and youth who have a vision impairment. As an example, Black children from the 12 states in which the BLAT was standardized were tested on the Hayes-Binet and the verbal portion of the Weschler Intelligence Scale for Children, revised. It was found that these children were one standard deviation below the mean. However, the raw scores on the BLAT indicated no differences. It was therefore concluded that the standardized test scores involved more items that sampled what the students had already learned, thus reflecting the differences between advantaged White students and disadvantaged Black students. Similar findings were found with Asian children.

The author concluded that the BLAT was not affected by the acculturation of a student. Additionally, it may discriminate positively for children and youth who are learning English as their second language.

Miramontes, O. (1993). ESL policies and school restructuring: Risks and opportunities for language minority students. The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students, 12, 87-92.

There are a number of critical issues and concerns that focus on strengthening and increasing the quality of instruction to linguistically diverse students. The first of these concerns stated that ESL cannot continue to be considered supplemental and incidental, but as a vital part of the educational system. The proposition is that ESL needs to be considered basic education within schools, otherwise the program and the instruction itself will become weakened. The ESL services students receive need to reflect quality instruction by an ESL certified teacher.

Many districts now rely on site-based management. Because of this, it is essential that teachers have clarity and understanding about what ESL is and what it is not. Teachers at individual sites are responsible for educating, designing, implementing, maintaining, and assessing language minority students.

There are two curriculum movements that cause concern for ESL implementation and instruction: Whole language as a process oriented approach, and cooperative learning strategies and integration of ESL students into the classroom setting. With caution and carefully planned instructional sequence, these each can play an important role in the educational process.

Allocations of resources target programs at site-based schools and management teams continually need to examine the program for the tendency to allow special funding to dictate pedagogy. The advantage of site-based management teams is that schools reflect understanding of second language acquisition and not just reflect legislative resource allocations. Also, creative solutions to use resources more effectively can emerge out of these schools.

Orlansky, M. D., & Trapp, J. J. (1987). Working with Native American persons: Issues in facilitating communication and providing culturally relevant services. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 81, 151-155.

This article stressed the need for professionals to respect and include Native American students' values, culture, and family life into the daily school environment. Suggestions for doing this included: (a) structuring cooperative rather than competitive activities, (b) encouraging group consensus rather than majority rule, (c) respecting the cultural value of personal privacy, and (d) valuing Native American heritage.

Additional cultural differences exist with regard to use of time and structure. Often, Native American families visit until late in the evening, resulting in students' difficulty staying awake the following day. Similarly, parents often wish to take their children hunting or to teach them some other Native American tradition during the day, and thus perceive the school as a barrier to the cultural education of their children.

The authors listed the following suggestions helpful in maintaining an effective working relationship with Native American students and their families:

- Do not expect direct eye contact
- Do not probe deeply
- Develop a tolerance for silence
- Do not reprimand nor praise a Native American student in front of others
- Make your handshake gentle
- Use demonstrations of actual skills and techniques
- Be sensitive to the Native American individual's perception of time and scheduling
- Respect the importance of the extended family
- Avoid condescending statements, stereotypes, and generalizations

Ponchillia, S. V. (1993). The effect of cultural beliefs on the treatment of native peoples with diabetes and visual impairment. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 87, 333-335.

Recently, there has been a rise in non-insulin dependent diabetes in Native American communities, resulting in the concomitant rise in diabetic retinopathy. Service providers, therefore, need to understand Native American cultural beliefs and the implications of those beliefs for services.

The following examples describe some cultural norms:

Cultural Values & Practices	Implications
•Introverted, concern for privacy	•Don't just start asking questions regarding personal matters, tell why you need to know
•Illness is thought to be supernatural	•Show an anatomical model of the eye; explain the problem concretely
•Healers traditionally give tangible objects	•Leave something at the end of a lesson (cane, pocket magnifier)

Consider the following suggestions for adaptations in a classroom setting:

- Elders/Circle: Ask to meet the elders and family members connected with the children and include them in IEP meetings and other school functions.
- Silence: Set up class time to incorporate room for silence; allow for a generous response time and incorporate small group activities.
- Pragmatic: Direct the focus toward working on adaptive skills rather than explaining too much about the eye condition.
- Hospitality: Incorporate the study of foods into content areas and encourage students to provide something to eat or drink when visitors come into the classroom.
- Time: Remain flexible with cultural perceptions of time and its management.

- Objects: Construct material representations of class activities to be taken home.

Ramsey, P. G. (1995). Growing up with the contradictions of race and class. Young Children, 50, 18-22.

Teachers of young children need to prepare themselves to meet the demands of dealing with issues of diversity and inequality as perceived by children. Teachers working with White, middle class children have the opportunity to prepare them to socialize and live in a multicultural society. Teachers often ask the following types of questions while trying to develop appropriate and necessary strategies for facilitating learning:

- How much do children notice race and class?
- How does their understanding of race and class change during early childhood years?
- How do children feel about racial and social class differences?
- Do these differences affect children's intergroup relationships?
- How can teachers prepare children to value diversity and to challenge the divisiveness and inequities that often accompany it?

Children have a difficult time with the many contradictions and ambiguities of our present society. The following guidelines are helpful when interacting and teaching children of different races:

- Be aware of current attitudes regarding race and social class and how they are intertwined in the family unit and community
- Understand the role teachers play in affecting attitudinal development
- Examine personal thoughts and feelings about cultural diversity
- Keep an updated focus on families and communities as to their feelings and perceptions of their role in society
- Use family interviews to gain insight into their views and feelings regarding race and status; include parents in student projects

Rodriguez, R. (1995). Latino educators devise sure-fire K-12 dropout prevention programs. Black Issues in Higher Education, 35-37.

The school dropout rate of Latinos in the United States remains very high. As a result, there are few Latino teachers and faculty members. In the past, schools have tried to eradicate the language and culture of Hispanic students, rather than embracing the differences and seeing the differences as opportunities for enrichment.

The article discussed the AVANCE project in San Antonio, Texas; a nine month program focused on educating Latino parents. The objective of the program is to provide an adequate foundation of learning and knowledge for parents so that education is valued and modeled for their children. The results of the program indicated its success, as increasing numbers of Latino parents were obtaining their Graduate Equivalency Diploma, and their children were graduating from high school at increased rates. To reduce the dropout problem, schools should begin to recognize the unique language and culture of Latino students and build successes for students upon this positive perspective.

Rueda, R. (1989). Defining mild disabilities with language-minority students. Exceptional Children, 56, 121-128.

There are some specific problems relative to the placement of language minority students in special education programs Among these are (a) inappropriate assessment procedures and tools, (b) inadequacy of instructional interventions, (c) difficulty separating language problems from learning disabilities, and (d) inappropriate placements.

Professionals use varying approaches to assess language minority students, classified by the author as a system-maintenance approach, system-improvement approach, and a system-restructure approach. The system maintenance approach administers assessment tools and dictates the service delivery deemed most appropriate for the student. The system improvement approach attempts to broaden the areas of referral, assessment, and placement. Second language acquisition is taken into consideration and attempts are made to clarify true difficulties. Students are placed more appropriately when language and cultural differences are taken into consideration. The system restructure approach conceptualizes assessment procedures differently. The assessment of the student takes place in the context of where the difficulty exists with an alliance of special, general, and bilingual education services available. The language minority student is thereby represented within the spectrum of disabilities.

Ruiz, N. T. (1989). An optimal learning environment for Rosemary. Exceptional Children, 56, 130-144.

This article discussed the placement of language minority students into special education, and instructional strategies for language minority students identified as mildly disabled. The article proposed a new model for a bilingual special education classroom; one that looks for the "upper range" of a bilingual students' academic, social, and linguistic skills. Once those skills have been determined, the model examines the contextual features that occur simultaneously with the enhanced view of their skills and seeks to recreate those features in an optimal learning environment.

The author developed nine instructional principles to serve as a framework for teaching language minority students identified as having mild disabilities. Initially, take into account students' sociocultural backgrounds and possible learning disabilities and the effect of these on oral language, reading and writing, and second language learning. Next, follow developmental processes in literature acquisition and locate curriculum in a meaningful context where the communicative purpose is clear and authentic. Principles five and six suggest connecting the curriculum to students' personal experiences and incorporating children's literature into reading, writing, and English as a second language (ESL) lessons, then involve the parents as active participants in their children's learning processes. Finally, give students experiences with whole texts in reading, writing, and ESL lessons, and to incorporate collaborative learning whenever possible. All of these components move a student toward an enriched, holistic curriculum that is much more typical of a gifted program than a remedial one.

Ryan, F. J. (1993). The perils of multiculturalism: Schooling for the group. Educational Horizons, 134-138.

The goal of multicultural education is to alter the complete educational environment, promoting respect for diverse cultural groups and enabling all cultural groups to experience equal educational opportunities. Some view multicultural education as central to a political agenda of separation in language and culture; a path to maintaining grievances and condemning American society. Still others discuss the awareness of differences among ethnic groups and caution the need for sensitivity to a given group's ancestral heritage, life experience at the time, and how it impacted their lifestyle, thus affecting how their cultural group was viewed at that time in comparison to their present-day ethnic group.

Interesting information for future teaching in the area of multiculturalism included:

- Developing an awareness and understanding of the role of the school in a situation where support must be identified and given to promote student achievement and self esteem.
- Facilitating students' internal locus of control that will ultimately contribute to their ability to take risks and make sound choices.
- Being open-minded about the concept of multiculturalism and remember individuality within a group context.

Schiff-Meyers, N. B., Djukic, J., McGovern-Lawler, J., & Perez, D. (1993). Assessment considerations in the evaluation of second language learners: A case study. Exceptional Children, 60, 237-248.

A child learning a second language before the primary language is fully developed may show arrested development or loss of proficiency in the first language. A delay in learning both languages may be misdiagnosed as a language disorder, rather than a temporary limited English proficiency. This may happen to a language minority child entering school with little or no English. It is critical for educators to differentiate between a limited English proficiency and an actual learning disorder.

To aid in a proper diagnosis, the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association recommended the use of language sampling in both languages in a naturalistic context with a native speaker in each language. These samples should include information about content, use, and form. Comparison to other children from the same cultural and linguistic background is also useful in distinguishing learning disorders from the typical challenges in learning a second language. Additionally, input from care givers should be sought and evaluated, along with a thorough case history.

Sontag, J., & Schacht, R. (1994). An ethnic comparison of parent participation and information needs in early intervention. Exceptional Children, 60, 442-433.

This study examined whether ethnic differences would change parents' perceptions of the information needed and the source of information, as well as the type of parent participation exhibited. Interviews were conducted with 536 families with infants and toddlers with developmental problems. The results covering parent information needs and problems in acquiring this information were reported by race.

Many parents reported they received confusing, wrong, or incomplete information from different sources, and were not told what services were available. They felt their participation was hindered by this lack of information and that having complete information would have helped them be more involved in meeting their child's needs. Ethnic specific, American Indian and Hispanic parents reported a greater need to receive information regarding the acquisition of services when compared to White parents. American Indian parents indicated they wanted more information on parent's rights than did Hispanic or White parents.

American Indian parents reported significantly more often than they were not told why a service could not be provided, than were Hispanic and White parents. Hispanic families were much less likely than White and American Indian parents to feel they had been told what could be done for their child. Concomitantly, American Indian and Hispanic parents were significantly less likely to provide information in comparison to White families. Finally, American Indian parents reported they wanted

119

professionals to avoid the use of jargon much more frequently than did White of Hispanic parents.

Professionals need to provide concise, accurate information about all available services and how the system works, so parents can choose the most appropriate services for their child. This study offered evidence that families from diverse ethnic and cultural groups have unique needs.

Stephens, N., & Averitt, E. (1993). Cultural diversity in action. Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness, 87, 188-190.

The Arizona School for the Deaf and the Blind (ASDB) sought to expand the lives and opportunities of the multicultural students in attendance there. Programs focused on cultural diversity, vocational planning and work experience were developed.

Enrollment at ASDB represents a wide cross section of the population of Arizona, with 50 percent of the enrollment representing Native Americans and Mexican Americans and the other 50 percent comprised of Anglo Americans. ASDB fostered appreciation and respect for the norms, mores, and beliefs of all cultures in a variety of ways. The school provided students with educational experiences, extracurricular activities, and opportunities for socialization and cultural growth designed to promote multiculturalism within the school and surrounding community.

The Spanish club at ASDB provided students with the opportunity to learn about Hispanic culture, further identify with their own Hispanic backgrounds, and refine and polish Spanish language skills. Guest speakers helped increase awareness of the unique Hispanic culture, and participation in holidays such as Cinco de Mayo served further to develop appreciation for other cultures. ASDB also has a Native American club which offers similar opportunities for and experiences in Native American culture to interested students.

Vocational activities and experiences receive emphasis when developing student educational plans and serve to better prepare students for life after graduation. These activities are coupled with transitional plans preparation designed to best meet the unique vocational, cultural, emotional, social, and educational needs of each student.

Theobald, P. & Donato, R. (1993). Ethnicity and class: The schooling of dust bowl and Mexican migrants during the depression era. Educational Horizons, Spring, 142-149.

The educational opportunities afforded Mexican migrant workers and migrants from the Great Plains make for interesting comparisons. These two groups migrated primarily to California and the Northwestern United States. Despite ethnic, cultural, and linguistic differences, both of these groups were unwanted, exploited, and unequally served in public schools.

The focus of education for Mexican American children was on patriotism and developing feelings of nationalism, to the disregard of basic content. Mexican American students were labeled as poor, spoke Spanish, and were culturally different from their schoolmates, and were thus segregated from their peers.

Between 1931 and 1939 the west coast states received migrants from the Great Plains who were willing to do work unwanted by others. Interestingly, ethnic and racial rationales could no longer justify low wages and poor working conditions, and the states' socioeconomic structure chose to view these migrants as inferior. Their children did not fare much better. These students were placed in special classes and labeled as deficient. Often, these students were failed and held back leading to a high rate of school dropout. However, with the onset of World War II, the Great Plains migrants were able to move into higher paying jobs and their children were placed in regular school programs.

Regrettably, class is determined by ethnicity in America. These authors further subscribe that public schools perpetuate extreme social and economic divisions according to ethnicity.

Trachtenberg, B. (1995). Using oral histories to elicit reflective writing: The experience of being an immigrant adolescent in the urban United States. Multicultural Review, 4, 28-63.

This article described a multicultural oral history project involving nine ninth grade students from various cultures and countries, attending a

Massachusetts high school. Students spent the first four weeks learning about culture, immigration, acculturation, and oral history. Students were taught interviewing techniques, as well as use of technical equipment to be used when interviewing. During the next four weeks, students completed three interviews with family and community members concerning change of culture. The final four weeks involved personal reflection and self and peer critiquing, to encourage deeper levels of reflection and understanding of ideas.

Excerpts of student writings revealed common concerns about cultural displacement, religion and culture, physical survival, gender, language with teachers and peers, and identity. These writings reflected the challenge of understanding and adapting to the new culture, and of trying to balance and integrate the new and old customs and beliefs. These narratives revealed poignant insights involving common frustrations and misunderstandings occurring at school. Several students related experiences when they had been ridiculed or chastised for not following teacher directives, because they had not understood what they were being asked to do.

This type of curriculum provides a meaningful and motivational method for addressing and reinforcing literacy skills, communication, and social skills. Furthermore, many valuable insights surrounding the acculturation process are gained by students and teachers alike, increasing understanding and awareness of diversity.

Ward, C. (1995). American Indian high school completion in rural Southeastern Montana. Rural Sociology, 60, 416-434.

The dropout rate of American Indian youth continues to be exceptionally high, despite an increase in high school completion from 22 percent in 1970 to 66 percent in 1990. Indian children and youth living on reservations and in rural settings received a lower standard of education than those living in urban settings, due to cultural and structural causes, as well as a lack of resources to attract well-trained personnel and purchase necessary technological equipment. The author explained that "limited local employment opportunities make it difficult for Indian adults to translate their accomplishments into desired jobs and income in rural and reservation settings". The jobless rate therefore, among American Indians is higher than for any other demographic group.

There are several factors which reduce the dropout risk. Among these are active involvement in extracurricular activities and satisfactory academic achievement. Additionally, if parents finished high school, the child will probably do likewise. Other factors include the structure of the family, parents' employment history, a strong social network, parent contact with schools, and parental interest in the majority culture.

Appendix A

Educating Students with Visual Disabilities and Limited English Proficiency (LEP): A Survey of Educators

Part I

Please rate your knowledge of the following items and how important you think each item is in the education of students with visual impairments who are in the process of learning English. Think of each item as it relates to the educational program for students with visual impairments who have been identified by your school district or agency as having limited English proficiency (LEP).

Rate your knowledge of each item using this scale: 1=Not Satisfactory (NS) 2=Somewhat Satisfactory (SS) 3=Satisfactory (S) 4=Highly Satisfactory (HS)	Rate how important you think each item is using this scale: 0=I don't know (DK) 1=Not Important (NI) 2=Somewhat Important (SI) 3=Of Average Importance (AI) 4=Highly Important (HI)

How do you rate your knowledge of this item?					**How important is it for you to know about this item?**				
NS	**SS**	**S**	**HS**		**DK**	**NI**	**SI**	**AI**	**HI**
1	2	3	4	Federal, state, and district regulations (including testing and placement) related to LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Historical, legal, and educational bases for the establishment of support programs for LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Teaching techniques effective with LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Basic concepts of second language acquisition.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Availability of print, braille, records, and film materials that will support the teaching of English.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Assessment issues related to LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Foreign language braille, particularly Spanish braille.	0	1	2	3	4

NS	SS	S	HS		DK	NI	SI	AI	HI
1	2	3	4	Curriculum modifications that will promote academic growth for LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Historical background of different cultural groups represented by the students in your caseload.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Understanding of teaching strategies used by bilingual educators and ESL teachers.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Knowledge and strategies to enhance cross-cultural communication with LEP students and their families.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Cultural perceptions of visual disabilities, particularly in cultures represented in your caseload.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Familiarity with cultural variables that could influence the learning process.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Strategies to work collaboratively with families from diverse cultures and language groups.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Familiarity with the language or languages spoken by students in your caseload.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Working knowledge of at least one language in addition to English.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Effective use of translators or interpreters to communicate with families.	0	1	2	3	4

NS	SS	S	HS		DK	NI	SI	AI	HI
1	2	3	4	Working in collaboration with a bilingual paraprofessional to foster the academic and language skills of LEP students.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Working in collaboration with bilingual and/or ESL teachers.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Familiarity with research related to students from diverse cultures and language groups with or without disabilities.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Familiarity with the differences between a language disability and the normal process of second language acquisition.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Understanding of the cultures and traditions of students in your caseload.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Understanding the impact of teacher expectation on student performance.	0	1	2	3	4
1	2	3	4	Creating a supportive learning environment that will value the cultural and language diversity of students.	0	1	2	3	4

Part II

We would like to know about the teaching approaches, methods, and strategies you are presently using with your English speaking and with your LEP students with visual impairments. Please rate the following items by circling the number which most accurately describes your teaching situation.

0=I am not familiar with the item **1=Never** **2=Monthly** **3=Weekly**
4=Daily **NA=Not applicable to my teaching situation**

How frequently do you use these approaches with the following students:

	English speaking VI students						**LEP students with VI**					
Basal readers	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Language Experience Approach	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Literature Approach	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Collaborative Story Writing	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Phonics-Based Instruction	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Peer Tutoring	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Cooperative Learning	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
One-on-one Direct Instruction	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Small Group Instruction	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Whole Language	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA
Patterns Reading Series	0	1	2	3	4	NA	0	1	2	3	4	NA

Please tell us about other teaching approaches, methods, and strategies you are using with your:

English speaking students with visual impairments:

LEP students with visual impairments:

Part III

We would like to know about the assessment and instructional practices provided in your school district or agency to address the needs of students with visual impairment who are in the process of learning English (LEP students). Circle the number which most accurately describes the testing and instructional practices in your setting.

Rate the frequency of each item using this scale:
0=Don't Know 1=Never 2=Sometimes 3=Frequently 4=Always

Assessment						**Instruction**				
0	1	2	3	4	LEP students are tested by bilingual psychologists or evaluators.					
0	1	2	3	4	Assessment and instruction provided in English only.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	Assessment and instruction provided in the native language in addition to English.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	Professionally trained translators are used.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	Bilingual paraprofessionals are used.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	Braille is available in the native language.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	LEP students are only tested orally because of lack of available tests in their native language.					
					ESL instruction is provided by certified ESL teacher.	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	2	3	4	Vision teachers, ESL instructors, bilingual educators, and O&M instructors work together.	0	1	2	3	4

Part IV

Please tell us about yourself by completing the statement or by checking the appropriate box:

1. Your position is:
   - ☐ teacher for the visually impaired
   - ☐ both teacher and O&M instructor
   - ☐ teacher educator
   - ☐ orientation and mobility instructor
   - ☐ administrator
   - ☐ other (please explain) ____________________

2. In which of the following settings do you teach?
   - ☐ Resource room program
   - ☐ Consultant services
   - ☐ University
   - ☐ Itinerant program
   - ☐ Special day school
   - ☐ Other: ____________________
   - ☐ Resource/Itinerant
   - ☐ Residential school

3. How many years have you been teaching students with visual disabilities? _______years.

4. In addition to teaching students with visual disabilities, have you taught students with other disabilities, including students with visual and other impairments, or students without disabilities?

Students with other disabilities	Students without disabilities
☐ yes ☐ no	☐ yes ☐ no
If yes, how long?________years	If yes, how long?________years

5. Are you a certified teacher in the area of visual disabilities? ☐ yes ☐ no

6. Are you a certified orientation and mobility instructor? ☐ yes ☐ no

7. In addition to your vision or mobility certification, in what other areas are you certified to teach?____

____

____

8. Highest degree earned:
☐ Bachelors degree ☐ Masters degree ☐ Doctorate degree
☐ Other (please specify)________________

9. Do you speak a language other than English? ☐ yes ☐ no
If yes, which language?________________

If you speak a language other than English, rate your proficiency in the non-English language:

Listening 0________1________2________3________4
Very Low Highly Proficient

Speaking 0________1________2________3________4
Very Low Highly Proficient

Writing 0________1________2________3________4
Very Low Highly Proficient

Reading 0________1________2________3________4
Very Low Highly Proficient

10. Have you had any training related to students with limited English proficiency, bilingual students, or students from diverse cultural and language groups? ☐ yes ☐ no

If yes, please tell us about the training:________________

____

____

11. What is your ethnic/racial background?
☐ African American ☐ Asian American
☐ European American ☐ Hispanic
☐ Native American ☐ Mixed Race/Ethnicity
☐ Other________________

12. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

13. Your age: [ ] Under 25 [ ] 26-30 [ ] 31-35 [ ] 36-40
[ ] 41-45 [ ] 46-50 [ ] Over 50

Part V

Please tell us about your students by completing the statement or checking the appropriate box:

1. How many students do you presently work with? ________________students

2. Tell us about their age and whether they have additional disabilities. How many students do you have in the following categories?

	0-36 mo	3-5 yrs	5-8 yrs	8-12 yrs	12-15 yrs	15-18 yrs	18+
Visually Impaired only							
Visually/multiple impaired							

3. How many of your students come from homes where a language other than English is spoken?

	0-36 mo	3-5 yrs	5-8 yrs	8-12 yrs	12-15 yrs	15-18 yrs	18+
Visually Impaired only							
Visually/multiple impaired							

4. How many of the students who come from homes where a language other than English is spoken are still classified as having limited English proficiency (LEP) according to your district's or agency definition?

	0-36 mo	3-5 yrs	5-8 yrs	8-12 yrs	12-15 yrs	15-18 yrs	18+
Visually Impaired only							
Visually/multiple impaired							

Part VI

Please share with us some of your opinions and concerns about current practices for educating LEP students with visual impairments

1. What other areas do you perceive to be important when working with students with visual disabilities and their families who are in the process of learning English?

2. What specific activities, skills, and knowledge have helped you the most when working with students with visual disabilities and their families who are in the process of learning English? Please feel free to share specific instructional strategies, materials, activities, etc.

3. What are some issues that concern you about the testing practices currently taking place in your school to test LEP students with visual impairments?

4. What are some issues that concern you about the instruction provided to LEP students with visual impairments in your school?

Thank you for your cooperation.